

CATHOLIC
PRINCIPLES
AND THE
CHANGE OF NAME

RANDOLPH H. Mc KIM, D.D.



BX 5925 .M3

McKim, Randolph H. 1842-
1920.

~~The material to change the~~

Section

M2127



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES AND THE CHANGE OF NAME

LIBRARY OF THE
NOV 7 1913
THEOLOGICAL SEMINAR

THE PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH

CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF TRUE CATHOLIC
PRINCIPLES

BY

REV. RANDOLPH H. McKIM

D.D., LL.D., D.C.L.

RECTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE EPIPHANY, WASHINGTON, D.C.

God's holy gospel, the ancient bishops and the Primitive Church do make on our side.—BISHOP JEWEL

What if some new corruption go about to invade not only some portion of the Church, but also the whole universal church altogether? Then must a Christian man settle himself to cleave to antiquity.

ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, Fourth Century

NEW YORK
E·P·DUTTON & COMPANY
PUBLISHERS

UNIVERSITY PRESS, CAMBRIDGE, U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

INVITED in the great and holy name of Catholicity to join the crusade against the name which our Church has honorably borne for a century and a quarter, and which was used as descriptive of the Colonial Church and the English Church at least a century before that, we reply that as true Catholics we are in duty bound to refuse our aid.

The essays and addresses embraced in this volume were intended to justify that refusal. They have been written from the point of view of the Anglican ideal of Catholicity. That ideal is derived from primitive antiquity. It is formulated in the writings of representative divines of the Elizabethan age, and of the so-called Anglo-Catholic divines of the Caroline period. These writers were not ashamed to avow themselves protestants; they felt themselves compelled to become protestant in order to continue Catho-

lic; they would have been amazed at the attitude of the men among us who scorn and repudiate the title of "Protestant."

It must be evident to any one who has followed at all carefully the agitation for changing the name of our Church that the fundamental motive behind the movement, on the part at least of its most active promoters, has been to get rid of the protestant character which was stamped on the Anglican Church at the Reformation. This has been avowed again and again. The leading organ of the party of change has not hesitated to declare that *the end* the party has had in view for a generation has been to get rid of the obnoxious term "Protestant." The reason this elimination has been so persistently sought is that it would facilitate the grafting upon the doctrine and practice of the Protestant Episcopal Church the system of mediæval sacerdotalism. Thus, in reality, this attempt to change the name of our Church is an assault on the Prayer Book. There is involved in it an attempt to substitute an ideal of catholicity completely at variance with the ideal accepted by the reformers, and incorporated in the formularies

of the Anglican Church, so that in the last analysis the issue resolves itself . . . into a conflict between two distinct ideals of catholicity.

For this reason I have included in this volume two letters in which is set forth the doctrinal position of the Anglo-Catholic divines alluded to above, touching the chief points at issue between those who may be called Prayer Book Churchmen and the Reactionary, or Neo-Catholic, party.

I have also, in another essay, laid stress on the fact that the opposition to this proposal to change the name of our Church is in no sense partisan. It is not conducted under the banner of the Low Church party or the Broad Church party or the old High Church party. On the contrary, it unites in its ranks representatives of all three historical schools of thought—men who are loyal to the Prayer Book, and who in spite of many differences are linked together by the bond of fidelity to true Anglican principles, which they see imperiled by this movement of change.

Finally, I have given an exposition of true and false catholicity, endeavoring to set forth first the primitive ideal and then the

Anglican ideal of catholicity with special reference to the novelties of doctrine and practice introduced into our communion by the publication of the Oxford Tracts.

This, then, is the Catholic ground on which I have stood in the arguments presented in the following pages for rejecting the proposal made at Cincinnati — namely, to strike out the word “Protestant” wherever it appears in the official designation of our Church; so that the name should be simply “the Episcopal Church.” The most conspicuous supporters of the movement for change have indeed announced their complete and final abandonment of that proposal, and are now advocating the name “American Catholic Church.” Nevertheless it appears likely that there will be some influential delegates at the next general convention favoring the Cincinnati proposal. Should this proposal be, in fact, renewed, it will come forward stripped of the plausible plea then so effectively urged, namely, that it was an eirenicon under whose shadow the lion and the lamb should lie down in peace together. Events have shown that this proposal, far from making for peace, has been in fact

a firebrand rekindling the flames of controversy.

As to this name which is now proposed, a word may here be properly said. Our friends say: “ You declare your belief in the Holy Catholic Church whenever you recite the Creed; why, then, do you object to giving the Church a name corresponding with that article in the creed; why is Holy Catholic Church a good name in the creed and a bad name in the title of our Church? ” The answer ought to be sufficiently obvious: we believe the Protestant Episcopal Church to be *a part* of the Holy Catholic Church; we do not believe that she is *the whole* Catholic Church; nor do we believe that she is *the one representative* of the Catholic Church in the United States of America. It would be untrue to say that our Church is “ the American Catholic Church ”; she is, in fact, only a *part* of the Catholic Church in America; and it would be an intolerable assumption for us to claim that title, thereby excluding all other Christian communions from membership in the Holy Catholic Church. The Church of England and the Church of Ireland both claim to be parts of the Holy Cath-

INTRODUCTION

olic Church; yet neither of them has introduced the word “Catholic” into their official title nor into the title-page of their Prayer Books; neither of them claims to be the *whole and only* Catholic Church in their respective countries.

Some repetitions will necessarily be found in this volume, made up as it is of papers on the same topic delivered on different occasions. They serve, however, to emphasize important points.

R. H. McK.

WASHINGTON, March, 1913.

CONTENTS

I

PAGE

SHALL THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH ABANDON
HER PROTESTANT POSITION? 1

II

REASONS FOR ADHERING TO OUR PROTES-
TANT NAME 20

III

THE ATTITUDE OF PRAYER BOOK CHURCH-
MEN TOWARD THE PROPOSED CHANGE 53

IV

THE POSITIVE AND PERMANENT VALUE OF
PROTESTANTISM 95

V

DOES PROTESTANTISM SPELL PARTISAN-
SHIP? 111

VI

THE PROGRAMME OF THE NEO-CATHOLIC
PARTY 123

CONTENTS

VII

	PAGE
THE THEOLOGY OF THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC DIVINES	140

VIII

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE VINCENTIAN RULE OF CATHOLICITY	181
--	-----

IX

THE TEST AND STANDARD OF CATHOLICITY	193
--------------------------------------	-----

X

DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES ERRONEOUSLY CALLED CATHOLIC	227
---	-----

TITLE-PAGE TO THE PRAYER BOOK AS PROPOSED
AT THE GENERAL CONVENTION IN
CINCINNATI

The Book of Common Prayer
and Administration of the Sacraments
and other Rites and Ceremonies of
THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH.

According to the use of that portion thereof known as
The Episcopal Church
In the United States of America.
Together with
The Psalter or Psalms of David.

Part of a Resolution which was to have been offered if the proposal to change the name of the Church had been adopted by the House of Deputies:

Resolved, the House of Bishops concurring, That by such action there is intended or implied no changed relationship toward any other portion of the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, or toward principles established by or through the Reformation of the Church of England as those principles are enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer; but rather to set forth the actual continuity of this Church, through the ancient Church of England, from the historic Church founded by Christ Himself, which, from the second century, *Anno Domini*, has commonly been known as the Holy Catholic Church, in which Church we are accustomed to express our belief in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creed.

I

SHALL THE EPISCOPAL CHURCH ABANDON HER PROTESTANT POSITION?

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. — *Gal.* v. 1.

THIS impassioned appeal of the great Apostle to the Church in Galatia to guard well their spiritual liberty has found an echo in the hearts of Christian people many times in the long course of the ages. We hear it again today in our own Church, calling upon us to defend the spiritual freedom which was purchased for us at the Reformation.

We are confronted today by a serious issue. You are aware that in the recent convention at Cincinnati a proposal was made to change the name of the Church. The proposal involved two things. First, the assertion on the title-page of the Prayer Book, that this Church is a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. To this we make no objection; for it is only a reassertion of the statement which we make whenever we recite the

Apostles' Creed. Secondly, it involved the elimination of the word "Protestant," so that this should no longer be called the "Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," but merely "the Episcopal Church in the United States of America." This, be it observed, would not apply merely to the title-page of the Prayer Book, but wherever the word "Protestant" now stands in any part of the Prayer Book, or in the Articles of Religion, or in the Constitution and Canons of the Church, or in the Ordination Services, or in the Consecration Service, or in the Institution Office, it should be erased.¹

You will perhaps remember that this proposal was defeated by a non-concurrence of orders. It lacked only a single vote in the lay order. But while it was defeated, we are

¹ The preamble to the resolution of Mr. Pepper reads: "Whereas initial action has been taken by the General Convention of 1910, looking to the designation of this Church as," etc. This implies that the new name was to supplant the old everywhere. Logically it must do so. And the last resolution calls for such legislation as may be necessary "in order to bring the official standards of this Church into harmony with the action therein set forth." *The Living Church* stated editorially that the purpose was that the word "Protestant" should be "dropped from all our formularies."

confronted by the fact that it obtained a large majority in the clerical order; and those who advocate the change have proclaimed their determination to continue the agitation for the next three years, so that when the General Convention assembles in the city of New York in the year 1913, the question will again come up for decision; and it is confidently claimed that it will then secure a large majority in both orders.

Those of us who oppose this change are of opinion that it would be disastrous to the best interests of the Church. The arguments which are put forward in favor of the change appear to us wholly inconclusive; and we are of opinion that, although a considerable majority of the clerical order voted in favor of the change, it is more than doubtful whether they represent the sentiment of a majority of the communicants of the Church.

Under these circumstances it appears to be incumbent upon us to submit the question to the thoughtful consideration of the people of the Church, with the view of ascertaining their sentiment on the subject, so that when we go up to the next General Convention we shall be able to say what the mind of our sev-

eral congregations is upon this important issue.

I propose, therefore, on this and subsequent occasions, to discuss the several issues involved in this proposal, giving the arguments advanced in its favor, and the reply which we who oppose it make thereto. This morning it is my purpose to consider the significance of the word "protestant." We are told that it is a negative word, a sectarian word, a word that connotes division and separation. I affirm, on the contrary, that it is a positive word.¹ Etymology, lexicography, and history all unite in refutation of the assertion that it is a word of negation. It is older than the Reformation, older than the primitive Church. It came from the lips of Christ Himself, when, at Pilate's judgment seat, He said: "*To this end was I born and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth*" (John

¹ The verb "protest" is used six times in the Holy Scriptures; and in every one of the instances in which it is used it has the affirmative, not the negative, sense. For example: Jeremiah xi. 7: "I earnestly protested unto your fathers; . . . saying obey my voice." Compare Genesis xlivi. 3, 1 Samuel viii. 9, 1 Kings ii. 42, Zechariah iii. 6, 1 Corinthians xv. 31.

xviii. 37). He said to His disciples, the night on which He was betrayed, that “the Comforter,” the “Spirit of Truth,” should “bear witness of Him” (John xv. 26), and turning to His disciples He said, “Ye also shall bear witness” (John xv. 27). Now the word “protestant” is the equivalent in the Latin tongue of the Greek word which Christ used when He said these things. “Protestant” is from the Latin “protestor,” which means “to bear witness.” Here is the definition given in the Century Dictionary of the verb “to protest”: “To make a solemn declaration or affirmation; to bear witness or testimony to; to assert; to asseverate; to declare”; and again: “To bear testimony; to affirm with solemnity; to make a solemn declaration of a fact or opinion.” We affirm, then, that the word has the authority of Christ Himself. It describes the witness that He bore for the truth which God sent Him into the world to declare to mankind. It describes the witness which He commanded His disciples to bear for the truth which they received from Him. Our word “martyr” comes from the same Greek word which our Saviour used in this connection. The martyr is a witness

to the truth, a witness for Christ, and the Latin equivalent to the Greek word *μάρτυς* is “protestant.” Our Saviour, then, and His Apostles were protestants for the truth of Christianity, and they were protestants against the perversions of religion which the scribes and Pharisees had introduced. Again, the fathers of the Nicene age were protestants for the truth of the divinity of Christ, against the false doctrine of Arianism, when they put forth the Nicene Creed which stands in our Prayer Book today. And so, when the sixteenth century came, Martin Luther and his co-workers on the continent, and Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer in England, were protestants for the ancient primitive truths of Christianity, against the corruptions and perversions of the truth, which had come into the Church through the instrumentality of the Church of Rome.¹

Thus the word “protestant” has a noble, yea, a divine origin, and a perpetual significance for all the ages. It is a great word and has a great history. It stands for the witness of the Church of England for primitive

¹ Jeremy Taylor says that St. Augustine was a Protestant in his belief concerning the Holy Communion.

tive and catholic truth, and for her witness against the corruption of doctrine by which the primitive faith had been obscured.¹ We make no apology for it. It still stands for the same vital truths of our holy religion. It signifies the function of the Church as a witness-bearer, even as our Lord commanded and as He said of Himself.

Let it be observed that from the time of the Reformation to our own time the Church of England, from whose loins we are sprung, has been recognized as a Protestant Church, and has acknowledged herself such. The martyrs who laid down their lives in the Marian persecution died because they were Protestants. The great divines of the reign of Elizabeth acknowledged themselves Protestants. That illustrious company of divines of the Caroline period—sometimes called the Anglo-Catholic Divines—without exception, so far as I am aware, acknowledged themselves Protestants. The same is true of their successors in the Georgian period,

¹ “Protestantism, as understood in the seventeenth century, was a positive faith, not merely a negation, as some would make it. It meant the Christian faith cleared from the accretions of mediævalism” (Rev. F. Meyrick, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford).

and down to our American Revolution. I have not found that it was ever objected to by any conspicuous divine in the Church of England until the time of the Oxford Tracts, under the leadership of John Henry Newman and his co-workers, who subsequently abandoned the Church of England and went to the Church of Rome.¹

The protestantism of the Church of England is indirectly affirmed by the clergy in the Oath of Abjuration, required of all ecclesiastical persons. "The Clergy, therefore, in taking this Oath of Abjuration, have affirmed for generations that the successive sovereigns of England in communion with the Church of England are Protestants." The declaration prescribed by Act of Parliament in 1828, in lieu of the sacramental test, describes the Church of England as "*the Protestant Episcopal Church of England and Ireland.*" The act of Union between Ireland

¹ "The Caroline theology, while fighting Puritanism, was, nevertheless, Protestant to its core. . . . Until the present day there has never been any ecclesiastical party or any recognized theologian that did not firmly and thankfully stand by the principles of the Reformation, or hesitated to regard and proclaim the Church of England as a Protestant Church" (Rev. F. Meyrick, Fellow of Trinity College, Oxford).

and Great Britain in 1800 enacts that the Church of England and Ireland, as now by law established, be united into "*one Protestant Episcopal Church*, to be called the United Church of England and Ireland." As late as the year 1870 the Church of Ireland in her Constitution declared herself a Reformed and Protestant Church.

Further, this word "*protestant*" has a definite doctrinal significance. It means the assertion of the supremacy of the Holy Scriptures in all matters of religious belief; their supremacy over the teachings of tradition which governed the Church and overlaid the Scriptures at the time of the Reformation. It means also the assertion of the doctrine of salvation by faith in Jesus Christ, through His all-sufficient atonement and sacrifice consummated on the cross. In other words, it means the assertion of the doctrine of justification by faith instead of justification by works. It means the assertion of the one mediatorship of Jesus Christ, to the exclusion of all saints or angels as mediators between God and man. It means further the assertion that the ministers of Christ are His ambassadors and representatives and wit-

nesses; the ministers of reconciliation, and not a sacrificing priesthood, not a sacerdotal caste, not an order of men standing between the people and Christ as the necessary medium of communication with Christ. It means also the assertion that the ordinance instituted by Christ on the night He was betrayed was “the Lord’s Supper,” the Holy Communion, and not as the Church of Rome affirmed and affirms now, the Sacrifice of the Mass in which the priest offers the body, soul, and divinity of Christ on the altar as a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of man.

In other words, the word “protestant” affirms the doctrine which is embodied in our catechism and our articles, and in the office of the Holy Communion concerning that Sacrament. And finally, the word “protestant” is an affirmation of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and the necessity of conversion, and of the grace and guidance of God, the Holy Ghost, in the Christian life from the beginning to the end. It is the assertion of the liberty of conscience against the absolutism of the Mediæval Church. It stands for the direct access of the human soul to Christ without a mediating priesthood.

And now let me call attention to the fact that the assertion of the Protestant character of our Church is not at all in conflict with her position as a branch of the Holy Catholic Church of Christ. The Anglican communion has ever held herself loyal to the Catholic faith — professes, indeed, that she is a part of the Catholic Church. Her great divines and apologists have ever maintained that she stands upon Catholic ground; that her faith is the Catholic faith; that her order is the Catholic order; that her liturgy is derived from Catholic sources; that her rites and ceremonies have been established upon Catholic principles. But in order to maintain these Catholic principles it became necessary at the Reformation to purify the Church of the uncatholic doctrines and practices which in the course of ages had grown up. In other words, in order to remain Catholic, it was necessary for the Anglican Church to become Protestant. Thus Bishop Jewel indignantly repels the charge made by Harding, his Jesuit antagonist: "You say we have forsaken the Catholic Church; nay, we are returned to the Catholic Church of Christ." Again he says: "We have re-

turned to the Apostles and the ancient Catholic Fathers.” We lay it down as a fundamental axiom, that the true Catholic must become a Protestant when the one faith once delivered is imperiled, either by addition or diminution. The fathers of the English Reformation were Protestants against the heresies and usurpations of the Church of Rome, when they threw off the yoke of that Church, and established the Reformed Liturgy of the Church of England. Thus, the Church of England, in order to remain Catholic, was compelled to become Protestant; and today her Protestantism is an indispensable note of her true Catholicity. It is interesting to note that the members of the Church of England who came over with Lord Baltimore’s colonists in 1634 called themselves “Protestant Catholics.”

It follows that to call our Church Protestant in no way impeaches her antiquity or her apostolicity. In acknowledging her to be Protestant we do not make her date from the Reformation, any more than the adoption of the Nicene Creed made the Christian Church begin in the year 325! This has been the understanding of the great divines

of the English Church from the Reformation down to the period of the Oxford Tracts: Jewel, Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Andrewes, Cosin, Bull, Beveridge, Bramhall, Ussher, and Pearson. These great men did not repudiate the Protestant position of the Church of England. On the contrary, they justified it, they defended it, they gloried in it. The Reformation was, in their eyes, a purification that had become imperative in order to save Catholic truth. As Jeremy Taylor puts it, “The Church of England looked in the glass of Scripture and pure antiquity, and washed away those stains with which time and inadvertency and tyranny had besmeared her.” Even Archbishop Laud declared that he held to “the true Protestant religion established in the Church of England.”¹

To this day the Church of England stands upon Protestant ground, and is officially recognized as a Protestant Church. The new royal declaration recently adopted by the English Parliament reads as follows: “I do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of

¹ In another place he says, “And the Church of England is Protestant too.”

14 CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

God, profess, testify, and declare that I am a faithful member of the Protestant Church as by law established in England."

And yet, my friends, in the face of all this, it was proposed in our recent General Convention, and it will be proposed again three years hence, that we should change the name of this Church — that we should blot out from our escutcheon the word "Protestant," hallowed as it is by such great historical associations; expressive as it is of the Catholic position of this Church on the great fundamental verities of the Gospel; consecrated as it is by the blood of the martyrs. And upon what ground? I will today mention but one of the reasons given by those who favor this change. We are told, as I have said, that "Protestant" is a negative word; that it is a word of division; that it is a sectarian word; that it does not register the divine notes which make this Church an integral part of the historical body of Christ, the one Catholic and Apostolic Church. We, on the contrary, maintain that the word "Protestant" is a positive word; a word of affirmation and not of negation; that it is, as one has said, "a noble word, more hal-

lowed by high and sacred associations, and representing greater victories for God's truth and human righteousness and progress in modern times, than any other word which can be named." We maintain that it does register the divine notes of the Church. It stands for the open Bible; it stands for the supremacy and divine authority of Holy Scripture, as the final and supreme standard of religious truth and Christian life. It stands for the purity of the faith once delivered to the Saints. It stands for the liberty wherewith Christ has set His people free. It stands for the primitive faith of the Church as against those corrupt doctrines and practices which were thrown off in the sixteenth century. And it stands for the liberty of the Episcopate.

In conclusion, let me say that this subject has a peculiar interest in connection with the precious service of the Holy Communion in which we are to engage today. It is to our Protestant reformers that we owe it that, instead of the superstitious and unscriptural service of the Mass, we have today the service of the Holy Communion, the Lord's Supper, according to the institution of Jesus

Christ. It was around the doctrine of the Mass that the great battles of the Reformation were fought. Archbishop Cranmer, whose hand drew up our Communion service, called the Mass "the Devil's own invention." He asserted that transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the Mass were "the roots of the tree of Popery." He and his fellow reformers saw in the doctrine of transubstantiation and in the sacrifice of the Mass the complete denial of the revelation of the Gospel of Christ. It was because they denied this doctrine that they suffered martyrdom. They died at the stake that the Holy Communion might be restored to the people in place of the sacrifice of the Mass. This was the crucial question at issue in the Reformation. It was for this that two hundred and seventy-seven persons — men, women, and children — were burned at the stake in the reign of Queen Mary. It was for this that eight hundred learned Englishmen fled to the Continent during that same reign to save their lives.

Is it strange, then, that the word "Protestant" is to us a sacred word, enshrined in historical associations that are closely inter-

twined with all that is most noble and most heroic in the history of the Church? It is indeed, as has been said, “the echo of a battle cry,” but that battle cry is just as necessary today as it was three hundred years ago.

My brethren, this question must in the end be decided by the voice of the communicants of the Church, male and female. It is for you to say whether you want this great historic word that stands for liberty of conscience and purity of doctrine to be blotted out of your Prayer Book wherever it now occurs. Can this be done without repudiating the doctrine for which it stands? Can it be done without casting reproach upon the martyrs of the Reformation? Can it be done without repudiating the splendid history for which the word “Protestant” stands? Shall we confess that the Reformation was a mistake, if not a crime? Shall we say by this act that the whole history of these well-nigh four hundred years had all a false motive, an unreal basis? And shall we do this at a time when both here and in England many of the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation are being repudiated — when

Auricular Confession, and Reservation of the Sacrament, and Eucharistic Adoration, and Invocation of Saints are widely practiced, and when strenuous efforts are making to bring back the Sacrifice of the Mass?

I leave the question with you.¹

¹ The following letter appeared in the Church press the last week in November, 1912:

MR. EDITOR,—Allow me to lay before your readers the following analysis of the vote in the General Convention at Cincinnati, upon the question of striking out the word "Protestant" from the official name of the Church; so that it should henceforth be known as "The Episcopal Church." It appears that in the clerical vote forty-two dioceses voted in favor of the change and only fifteen voted against it. Also, that in the lay vote thirty-one dioceses voted in favor of the change and only twenty-four against it. Then there were in the clerical vote ten dioceses "divided" and in the lay vote eight dioceses "divided."

I have made a calculation of the comparative strength of this vote reckoned by communicants; and it appears that the affirmative vote in the clerical order in favor of the change represented 448,960 communicants, and the negative vote opposed to the change in the clerical order represented 340,678 communicants. As to the lay vote, the dioceses voting in favor of the change represented 345,479 communicants; the dioceses voting against the change in the lay vote represented 431,253 communicants. In other words, supposing the clerical vote to represent the mind of the Church, we have 448,000 communicants in favor of the change and 340,000 communicants opposed. On the other hand, if we take the lay vote as representing the mind of the Church, we have 431,000 opposed and 345,000 in favor of the change. Thus we have the interesting fact that there is almost a complete balance between the communicant

THE CHANGE OF NAME 19

strength of the dioceses favoring the change and that of those opposing the change.

Another interesting fact developed is this: the forty-two dioceses whose clerical vote was cast in favor of the change represent a total missionary offering of \$318,559; while the thirty-one dioceses whose lay vote was cast in favor of the change represent a total missionary offering of \$238,808. On the other hand, the fifteen dioceses whose clerical vote was cast against the change at Cincinnati represent a total missionary offering of \$509,042; while the twenty-four dioceses whose lay vote was cast against the change represent a missionary offering of \$566,540.

I submit that these two facts have a momentous bearing upon the question of the advisability of attempting to change the name of the Church.

I believe it is generally understood that the proposal brought forward at Cincinnati will not be renewed in New York in 1913. Instead, the majority of those who are agitating for a change ask us to accept the name "The American Catholic Church." Now, it is well known by those who have investigated the matter, that many individuals and dioceses voted in favor of the Cincinnati proposal because it seemed so simple and because it was put forward ostensibly in the interest of peace and harmony. It is not, therefore, to be anticipated that this new proposal will command anything like so large a vote as the other did, so that there is little probability of its being accepted by the next General Convention.

It may be well, notwithstanding, to suggest to those who are agitating for this change, that they consider seriously what would be the result of its adoption upon the missionary work of the Church. Is it likely that the strong missionary parishes and dioceses which now so liberally support the Board of Missions will be able to command anything like an equal support for the work of the Church if a name should be adopted which is so deeply repugnant to the principles and conventions of those parishes and dioceses?

RANDOLPH H. MCKIM.

WASHINGTON, D. C., Nov. 21, 1912.

II

REASONS FOR ADHERING TO OUR PROTESTANT NAME

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage. — *Gal.* v. 1.

SPEAKING from this text a week ago, I called your attention to the movement, defeated at Cincinnati last month, but to be renewed in New York in 1913, to strike the word “Protestant” from the official name of our beloved Church, in all her formularies, so that she shall no longer be known as the Protestant Episcopal Church, but as the Episcopal Church.

On that occasion I explained the meaning of the word “Protestant,” as expounded by its history.

This morning I desire to speak first of *the origin* of the name of our Church. It has often been affirmed that the name “Protestant Episcopal” was introduced by accident or without authority. In one of the debates in the General Convention years ago a deputy

asked "whether there was any other authority than that of the printer" for its introduction.

History gives overwhelming refutation to these statements, as witness the following facts:

First, before the assembling of the General Convention of 1785, the name "Protestant Episcopal" "had been officially recognized in the Church in six of the seven States there represented, and had been deliberately and by vote adopted by two of them."¹

Second, the committees appointed to report necessary alterations in the Liturgy were also directed to draft "An ecclesiastical constitution for the Protestant Episcopal Church."

Third, in each of the three reports of the committee to the Convention, the name "Protestant Episcopal" is used, and in the draft of the preamble and constitution the name is used six times. Thus the name of the Church was adopted with the utmost deliberation and forethought.

But why was this particular name adopted?

¹ Rev. John H. Elliott, S.T.D.

It has been said that it was an invention of two or three clergymen in the State of Maryland in 1780, some years before the assembling of the first General Convention. Instead of this, the fact is that the term "Protestant Episcopal" is found in use in the colony of Maryland as early as A. D. 1666.¹ And in Pennsylvania in 1778 the case of "The Protestant Episcopal Missionaries" was laid before the State authorities.

In our American Colonies the Church of England was commonly known as a Protestant Episcopal Church. It had received the same designation in England, and its members had been called "Protestant Episcopalian" for at least a century and a quarter before the American Revolution. A correspondent of Archbishop Bramhall, writing in 1651, uses the term "Protestant Episcopalian" in contradistinction to the Puritan-Presbyterians (see Works of Bishop Bramhall, vol. i. p. cxxviii). He uses it casually, as if well understood. In 1782 Dr. Berkeley writes of "the neglected sons of Protestant Episcopacy on the other side of the Atlantic," and again of conveying "the great

¹ Gambrall's *Church Life in Colonial Maryland*, p. 41.

blessings of the Protestant Episcopate," and again of "American Protestant Episcopacy." In 1785 the famous Granville Sharp wrote of the possibility of establishing a Protestant Episcopal Church in Holland.

Note also that the Primate of the Scotch Bishops, writing after the American Revolution, expressed his "hearty concurrence in the proposal for introducing 'Protestant Episcopacy' in America." And he, be it remembered, was the consecrator of Bishop Seabury. And in 1786 the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in their letter to the General Convention, used the name "Protestant Episcopal Church" without question. This name, "Protestant Episcopal," now so much objected to by some, has been officially applied to the Church of England, the Church of Scotland, and the Church of Ireland.

"It was, then, no printer's mistake, nor accident, nor anything of the sort, but it was the most natural thing in the world, that when the Church in this country became independent of the jurisdiction of England, she should take a name by which she had long been popularly known, as her legal title,

and accepted as the name by which she should be *known in law*. . . . Observe that she invented no new name; there was no need of any discussion, but she simply accepted as a matter of course the name descriptive of her character and polity by which she had always been known, and called herself ‘The Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America,’ to distinguish her from the ‘Protestant Episcopal Church in England.’ This is the way it all came about, as can be seen from the history of the period, and is implied in the preamble of the Constitution itself: ‘Whereas, in the course of Divine Providence, the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America is become independent of all foreign authority,’ etc. It is the same Church known by the same name which ‘*is become* independent in the United States of America.’ It is also significant in this connection that our first American Bishop Seabury derived his Episcopate not from the Church of England, but from an ‘Episcopal Church’ not at that time in communion with her, known as the ‘Episcopal Church in Scotland,’ and whose members were spoken of in the writings of

their own Bishops as ‘Protestant Episcoparians’ (Rev. Wm. Short).’¹

Why, then, should the name be changed? It is an honorable name — a name that truly designates our doctrine and our polity — a name that is identified with the history of our Church in America for more than a century and a quarter of honorable Christian endeavor. It may not be a record to boast of, but it is certainly not one to be ashamed of. Moreover, it links us with our mother Church, which was described as “Protestant Episcopal” in the colonial period, and in England for at least a century and a quarter

¹ Thus, to quote the words of the Rev. Dr. John H. Elliott: “Amid almost perfect unanimity was the baptismal name of the new-born National Church decided on. Her past and her present, her ancestry and her environment, suggested and recommended the name ‘Protestant Episcopal.’ Though the family to be consulted and gratified was numerous, it seems that but a single opposing voice was heard, and was heard only to be disregarded. . . . Friends across the seas, anxiously watching her infancy, had unconsciously foreshadowed the name ‘Protestant Episcopal’; and if two Churches were her sponsors, then the one, the ‘Episcopal Church of Scotland,’ has recorded her approval of the name by since applying it to herself, and the other, the ‘Church of England,’ as her baptismal gift, gave the Episcopate, which she had withheld from the Church of England in the Colonies, to the Church called the ‘Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America’” (*Shall the Name be Changed?* pp. 34–35).

before the name was formally adopted by Bishop White and his co-laborers.

It is moreover a name that links us in perennial fellowship with Protestant Christendom, and is thus a bond of union with more than one hundred millions of our fellow-Christians, who hold with us the faith once delivered to the Saints — Christians, moreover, with whom we are in closer touch than with any other portion of the Church Catholic, and who are doing much the larger part of the great work now going on for the conversion of the world to Christ.¹

I ask again, why should this name be changed? What has taken place to justify the change? The Church has prospered under this name, both at home and abroad. We have increased in the last sixty years three times as fast as the population. Our missionary work has vastly expanded, and no great stream of immigration can be pointed to in explanation of our growth, as in the case of the Roman Church.

We have no apology, then, to make for the

¹ Bishop Gore says: "It is good for us to feel how small a proportion of what is being done in the name of Christ all the world over is being done by the Anglican Communion."

name of our Church. It had an honorable origin, and it is a truly descriptive title. The word "Episcopal" declares our ecclesiastical polity. It affirms that we retain the three orders of the ministry, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, which have existed in the Church from the time of the Apostles to the present day; and the word "Protestant" distinguishes it from other Churches, which, like ourselves, retain the three orders of the ministry. It bears witness to the fact that at the Reformation this Church threw off the yoke of absolutism and asserted her freedom in Christ Jesus; that she also purified herself of the corruptions of doctrine and the superstitious practices which had grown up in the course of ages; and that she reasserted that primitive and Catholic doctrine which had been obscured and overlaid by the force of tradition.

A change of name implies a change of idea, a change of principle, a change of doctrine; but this, so far as we are concerned, has not taken place. Yet the change proposed would proclaim to the world that we had shifted our ground, that we had abandoned some of our distinctive principles. The American

people would certainly understand that we had given up the thing as well as the name. Our Protestant brethren would feel that we had drawn away from them and made an advance in the Roman direction. We believe that if, as is now proposed, we strike out the word "Protestant," we shall alienate from us those great Protestant Communions; we shall forfeit the leadership which is now conceded to us, and put back many years the great movement for Christian unity.

Our friends of the other side appeal to us in the name of Christian unity to do this thing, which is so repugnant to our feelings, so contrary to our convictions of duty, and the truth of God. We tell them in reply, that if there were no other reason for rejecting their proposal, our loyalty to the sacred cause of Christian unity would absolutely require us to do so. Let them investigate the subject; let them inquire among the leaders of the great Protestant Communions around us how their people would view such action as they ask us to agree to, and they will find that they are in error. The evidence on this subject is clear and unquestionable. It is overwhelming. These our brethren would

accept this action as evidence of a wider breach between them and us; they would see in it the triumph of the anti-Protestant party in our Church.

It was reported at Cincinnati that a highly esteemed Presbyterian layman had said that if he had been a member of our Convention he would have voted for the change. Well, individuals who take eccentric views can always be found. But when I asked Rev. Dr. Fox, Secretary of the American Bible Society, what he thought would be the impression made on the Protestant churches in America by the adoption of this proposal, he promptly replied that they would understand that we were drawing away from them under the influence of the anti-Protestant party in our Church.

And last week, finding myself in a group of nine of the most prominent Protestant ministers of this city, leaders in their several denominations, I put the same question to them, and received without a dissenting voice the same answer.

But we are told, however necessary it may have been in the sixteenth century to empha-

size our Protestant position, it is not necessary now. Times have changed; this is an age of toleration; religious persecution no longer exists; Christians are holding out their hands to one another in mutual respect and affection; the heart of Christendom is yearning for unity. Why, then, perpetuate the word which emphasizes our differences, which stands for division rather than for unity? Our answer is that whenever the Protestant Evangelical churches around us are ready for unity we will be ready to meet them more than half-way. When the time comes that these great Protestant churches can be fused with our own into one great Church, we will be ready to adopt any name that shall be found best to symbolize the position of reunited Christendom. But that time is not yet. As things stand now, the witness of this Church for primitive and Catholic truth was never more needed than it is today; and therefore the maintenance of our Protestant name is as necessary as it was in the sixteenth century.

Now, as regards the Church of Rome, her departure from the purity of the primitive faith is even greater now than at the period

of the Reformation. The dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin had not then been proclaimed, and Mariolatry had not reached the blasphemous extreme that we witness today. Again, the infallibility of the Pope was not then a dogma of the Church, binding upon all Roman Catholics; and accordingly the bondage of the mind and conscience was not as absolute as it is today. I know of no superstitious and unscriptural doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome that was in vogue in the sixteenth century that is not asserted and practiced in our time. Even here in enlightened America, where continual contact with Protestants and their ideas does materially modify the superstition which rules in Roman Catholic countries, the worship of relics exists (as in the case of an alleged bone of St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin, in a parish in Brooklyn); and the doctrine of Indulgences, which fired the righteous indignation of Martin Luther, is preached, as in New Mexico, where people are promised an indulgence of millions of years if they use certain devotional manuals and recite a certain number of Ave Marias and Pater Nos-

ters. If, then, the Church of Rome continues to proclaim her false and unscriptural and uncatholic dogmas, why should we cease to bear witness for the pure Catholic doctrine of the primitive Church? Why should we blot out the word which registers before all men's eyes our solemn protest for the truth of God against the error of man?

Is it no longer necessary to bear witness for the supremacy of Holy Scripture as the divinely authorized standard of faith and conduct? Is it no longer necessary to bear witness for the freedom of the individual conscience, for the right of private judgment, for the sacred right of every human soul to direct access to God? Is it no longer necessary to bear witness for primitive and Catholic truth against the corruptions of the Dark Ages? Is it a matter of no consequence that this Church should continue her witness against the superstition of the Mass and of Purgatory and of Saint worship and of Mariolatry and of indulgences, and of the whole system of priestcraft by which the souls of men are still enslaved?

But there is another reason, all sufficient in itself, why this Church should do nothing that

may even *appear* to compromise her Protestant position. It lies nearer home; it is within our own pale; it concerns our own people. The primitive and Catholic doctrines which the reformers vindicated at the Reformation, and which the word “Protestant” in the name of our Church witnesses for today, are assailed by an active and vigorous body of men in our own Communion. These men assert that the ministers of Christ possess strictly sacerdotal functions; they urge the necessity of Auricular Confession as a preparation for the Holy Communion; they teach a doctrine of the real presence hardly distinguishable from transubstantiation; they speak of the sacrifice of the Mass; they celebrate Requiem Masses; they practice Eucharistic Adoration; they use prayers for the dead in the public service of the Church; they reserve the sacrament for the sick (in defiance of the Rubric), and some of them expose it for worship; they teach the invocation of Saints. These men cast reproach upon the reformers and reject many of the distinctive doctrines of the Reformation. They do not, indeed, accept the Reformation in its completed development, as em-

bodied in the Prayer Book of 1552 (which is in its main features very similar to our American Prayer Book), but only in its inchoate form, as it was in the first Prayer Book of Edward VI. That is, to them, the ideal, the real standard by which they regulate their practice. An eminent and distinguished divine of this school (by no means one of the extreme wing) thus described the transition from the first Prayer Book of Edward VI to that of 1552: "The Church fell among thieves, who stripped her of her raiment, and left her half dead" (Rev. Morgan Dix, S.T.D.).

The thieves, be it observed, were the reformers, and the raiment of which it was stripped was such things as these: Auricular Confession, Prayers for the Dead, Reservation, the use of wafer bread; the use of the Chasuble, Cope, and other eucharistic vestments; and the doctrine of a corporal presence in the Holy Communion.¹

Now, in view of the existence among us of

¹ "It retained," says one of its eulogists, "for the Holy Communion the old name of the Mass, had in it prayers for the faithful departed, sanctioned Auricular Confession, and prescribed the use of Vestments, and the unction of the sick." It teaches distinctly the Sacerdotal System.

such a school as this—strong, aggressive, defiant—it may well be asked if this is the time to urge us to consent to eliminate that great, historic word, which stands for the witness of this Church against all these uncatholic doctrines and practices—these perversions of primitive truth?

The Church of England in the sixteenth century was in warm sympathy with the Continental Reformed churches. She became the head and front of the opposition to Roman arrogance and Roman absolutism.¹ She has gained prestige by ages of noble leadership. Of this position and this leadership, we, of the daughter Church in America, have been the inheritors. Our leadership is largely and generously accepted in the American Protestant world. It is becoming more and more an accepted opinion that the re-union of Protestants must come through our Church. If now we take the step which is proposed, we shall lose our prestige, we shall

¹ Bishop Cosin, one of the most famous of the Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century, wrote: "In heart and affection we enjoy constant union with all other churches on the earth which bear the title of Christian, and profess the Catholic faith and religion. . . . We desire this to be particularly understood as referring to the Protestant Churches."

forfeit our leadership, we shall estrange our Protestant brethren, and put back the clock on the dial of Christian unity, no man can tell how long.

But it is said that the object of this proposed change is to assert the antiquity of our Church, to bring men to realize the continuity of this Church with the primitive Church of England. It is urged that our present name indicates that our Church began at the period of the Reformation. But surely that is a *non-sequitur*. As one of the early English divines expressed it, “A garden which has been weeded is the same garden that it was before the weeds were pulled up; and so the English Church is the same Church it was before the false doctrines that had grown up within it were rooted out at the Reformation.” The word “Protestant” signifies that the garden has been weeded, but it is the same garden that it was before. The adoption of the Nicene Creed, which made the Church Protestant against the error of Arius, did not forfeit the claim of the Church of that age to be the Church of the Apostles. In adopting this new creed in the year 325, the fathers of the Church

did not make a new Church; nor did the use of the Nicene Creed indicate that the Catholic Church had no existence until the reign of Constantine.

But waiving this, if the object of eliminating the word "Protestant" from the name of the Church is to correct the false impression that it had its origin in the reign of Henry VIII, why did not our friends who proposed this change accept the amendment of Dr. Parks, which was to declare on the title-page of the Prayer Book that our Liturgy is the Liturgy of "the Holy Catholic Church, according to the use of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America"? That amendment was not accepted, and the paper which is the organ of those who urge this change upon us declares that to have accepted it would not have settled the question, which can never be settled until the word "Protestant" is eliminated.

The eminent layman who was the leader of the debate on that side remarked that it was not safe to offend the American sense of humor by talking of "a Protestant Catholic"; but can so well-informed a theologian

as he have forgotten that a great school of divines in England, the Anglo-Catholic school, asserted their Protestant position in the same breath that they affirmed their loyalty to Catholic truth? He may permit us to remind him of a famous divine of the nineteenth century, Dr. Hook, who said, "We may be called Protestant or Protesting Catholics."

The distinguished layman just alluded to took the ground that by adhering to our present name "we bury ourselves under a multitude of American bodies." Well, my friends, if we are to be buried at all, we would rather be buried under a multitude of "Protestant bodies" than under the vast mass of Roman error and absolutism. We should have more hope of a joyful resurrection in the former case than in the latter. But are we thus "buried" because we retain the historic word "Protestant" in our title? Rather, is not our leadership ungrudgingly recognized? Was not this, indeed, one of the marked features of the recent "Laymen's Missionary Movement"? If it is a question of association or identification, we frankly say that we would far rather be identified

with the great Protestant churches around us than with the Church of Rome. What a contrast between the two! Look at the repression of scholarship which the Vatican decrees within its dominions! Look at the absolutism asserted in the two most recent Encyclicals of the present Pope, the *Pascendi Gregis*, and the *Motu Proprio*, which reach a pitch of intolerance and repression of liberty hardly ever equaled in the history of the Vatican! Look also at the moral failure of that great Church through a vast portion of its spiritual dominion, as in the West Indies, in South America, in the Philippine Islands! On the other hand, look at the immense intellectual output of the Protestant churches in England and in America! Look at their enormous contributions to Biblical scholarship! Look at their great achievements in the cause of moral reform and social betterment, acknowledged by such an eminent man as Cardinal Manning himself! Look at the splendid achievements of the Protestant churches in the missionary fields of the world! Bear in mind the acknowledgment recently made by a High Church English Bishop that five sixths of the work of

carrying out Christ's last commission to preach the Gospel to every creature is being done by the Protestant bodies of Christendom!

Having these things in mind, we have no hesitation in saying that we prefer to be identified with the Protestant world rather than with the Roman Catholic world. We do not like the ecclesiastical polity of the Protestant churches around us, but we put doctrinal purity and practical Christianity before correctness of ecclesiastical organization.

And when it is urged that to call ourselves "Protestants" is to be in the same category with Eddyites and Dowieites and Mormons and Spiritualists and many other eccentric sects, we ask if we shall cease to call ourselves "Christians" because all the 187 sects in the United States, including those just mentioned, also call themselves "Christians"? It is poor logic to argue against the use of a great and noble word because it has been abused.

Before closing I ought, perhaps, to notice one more argument put forward in support of this proposal. It is said that our Protes-

tant name is a barrier to the success of the Church in the West, in communities where there is a large foreign-born population; and also in the mission fields in foreign lands, particularly in Latin countries.

Now as to the West, it may be asked if there is such a prejudice against Protestantism among the foreign-born population, how does it come to pass that in the city of Milwaukee, which has such an immense foreign population, the Presbyterian Church is so eminently successful — so vastly more successful than those Churches of ours which proclaim themselves “Catholic”? Is not the Presbyterian Church “Protestant,” and does it make any secret of the fact? Do not these foreigners know when they enter it, as they do in such large numbers, that it is a Protestant Church?

And then, as to the alleged need of this change because the word “Protestant” is a barrier to our success in foreign countries, it may be said at once that the Protestantism of the Methodists and the Presbyterians does not appear to be any barrier to their remarkable success in Mexico, in Brazil, and in the City of Rome itself.

It would be strange, too, if the word "Protestant" were an obstacle to our success in a country like Porto Rico, where the word "Catholic" is associated with unreality and superstition in religion, with intellectual darkness and ignorance, and with gross immorality rather than with the fruits of the Spirit.

But we are told that the missionary Bishops in Latin countries are asking for the change, because in these countries the word "Protestantism" is equivalent to "infidelity," and the rendering of "Protestant Episcopal" into Spanish or Portuguese results in a very grotesque and almost ludicrous title.

But surely our title need not be *transliterated*; it should rather be really *translated* — rendered into words that will represent its true meaning. It may be suggested that the word "Evangelical" would represent truly the content of the word "Protestant" in Spanish or Portuguese. But aside from that, we have the assurance of one of our most experienced missionary Bishops that he finds no such antipathy to the Protestant idea in the great Empire of Brazil. He also assures us that the change of the title-page of the Brazilian Prayer Book was not occa-

sioned by any difficulty as to the use of the word "Protestant." Another (formerly the Bishop of Porto Rico) is on record as saying that, while there are real disadvantages in the present appellation, they are not so great as the injury that would be done by any change likely to be made. He says: "While the Church ought to assert her Catholicity, the best way to assert it in the mission field is to manifest it by works. We can very well explain to any one who wants to know that we are standing on the Catholic foundation."¹

Having these utterances in mind, and considering the great success of the Methodists and Presbyterians in the same Latin countries, we are quite prepared to accept the opinion of one of our most successful missionary Bishops that this demand from these Latin countries for the change of name is unreal.

As to the Philippine Islands, there cannot surely be any serious need of a change there, in view of the fact that the Bishop's avowed policy is to abstain from missionary work among the Roman Catholic population.

¹ Bishop Van Buren.

As to China and Japan, we have not sent our missionaries there to build up a branch of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but to plant the seed of Christian truth and let those great peoples develop in their own way their own branch of the Holy Catholic Church. In Japan that has already been done. Doubtless it will also be done in China as well.

It will thus be seen that this alleged loud call from the mission fields of the Church for a change in the name of the Church dies down to a very feeble whisper from a few very feeble missions in Mexico and Cuba. But were the call ten times as loud as it is, we say there are other ways of answering it than this which is proposed, and it were a strange and unnatural policy to grieve and alienate scores of thousands of her children in America in order to propitiate a handful of the Latin race.

For let it be clearly understood in advance, before this fatal step is taken, that for every Cuban or Mexican who may thus be won to look with favor upon our claims, a hundred true and loyal members of our Church at home will be alienated.

I have thus endeavored to put fairly before you the arguments used by the advocates of the change in the name of the Church, and our answers to them.

In conclusion, I feel bound to say that there is another argument which, although not alleged, constitutes the real strength and motive power of the movement—it is the desire to get rid of *the thing* as well as the name—to eliminate the Protestant principles on which this Church has rested ever since the Reformation. The movement for changing the name was inaugurated about twenty-five years ago by the so-called Catholic party in the Church, and it has been fostered and pushed chiefly by that party ever since. Those of that way of thinking belittle the Reformation, and are out of sympathy with the principles on which it was carried out. Of course, therefore, they want to get rid of the word “Protestant,” and with it of the thing for which it stands.

This, in the last analysis, is the issue before the Church: Will she surrender her Protestant heritage? Will she blot from her escutcheon the great word which for nigh

four hundred years has borne witness to her fellowship with the Reformation and with those primitive and Catholic doctrines then vindicated by the blood of the martyrs?

I do not forget that it was proposed to insert in the Prayer Book a new Preface in which it should be stated that the change of the name of the Church is not intended to signify "any changed relationship toward principles established by or through the Reformation of the Church of England, as those principles are enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer."¹

That assurance, made no doubt in good faith, does not carry conviction. It would not change the great outstanding fact that the Protestant name of the Church had been abandoned. The world would believe, naturally enough, that in abandoning the name we had abandoned the thing. And the conclusion could hardly be avoided that the

¹ It is well to recall here the words of a distinguished divine of the High Church School. He said: "The genuine principles of the English Reformation are embodied in the first Prayer Book of the English Church; and the alteration and revision of that Book were the result of a departure from those principles" (Dr. Morgan Dix).

change indicated the triumph of the anti-Protestant party in the Church.

The proposal was put forward as a compromise — in reality it was a surrender. It was intended doubtless as an eirenicon, but, as the majority of the Committee on the Prayer Book said in their report, “it is certain to prove a cause of discord.”

ADDENDUM

A writer in the *Living Church* says: “Many seem at least to repudiate the Prayer Book, that is to say, hold it up as something quite insufficient and inadequate.”

Referring to the line taken by the *Living Church*, he says: “I find a steady insistence [in your columns] upon Invocation of Saints, Prayers for the Dead, and Reservation of the Host. . . . Are we, as Churchmen today, to go before the world with an apology for what our Church was, up to the days of John Henry Newman, who ‘reformed’ it and left it? ”

As regards the practice of Reservation of the Sacrament, the *Living Church* throws all its influence in favor of the practice, ex-

plaining away the Rubric of the Prayer Book by what can only be described as manifest sophistry. In the year 1895 the House of Bishops in their pastoral letter said: “The practice of reserving the Sacrament is not sanctioned by the law of this Church, though the Ordinary may, in cases of extreme necessity, authorize the Reserved Sacrament to be carried to the sick.” Commenting upon this, a writer in the *Churchman* says: “It is well that we should face the facts. Under cover of this guarded sanction ‘in cases of *extreme necessity*,’ a widespread practice of Reservation has grown up without any Episcopal sanction, and only lately a defiant attitude has been taken by not a few, who assert that the Church has no law whatever on the subject, and that they are at liberty to do as they please.

“In many parts of the country the Sacrament is, as a settled use, openly reserved in the Church; it is used ‘as a center of prayer to secure our Lord’s perpetual Presence.’ ‘Services of Adoration’ and ‘Exposition’ and ‘Benediction’ are held, and a Cultus of the Blessed Sacrament established, such as this Church certainly has never known before.” In this connection attention may be

called to a recent utterance of "Presbyter Ignotus," the regular weekly correspondent of the *Living Church*. He says: "Why should not our Bishops put these questions at their visitations? Is the Blessed Sacrament reserved, and is Its Presence suitably indicated?"

Articles appear in the Church papers on the "*Miracle of the Altar*," in which it is claimed that the Priest in the Communion Service "lays hands upon bread and wine and makes them the body and blood of Christ." "So you behold upon the sacred altar — what? Bread and wine? Yes; but veiled within their substance God Enthroned! The flesh and blood of the incarnate risen Lord!"

In a sermon delivered by an English clergyman recently, we find this: "What I mean is this: if I hold up a wafer before it is consecrated, I say, 'This is bread'; if I hold it up after consecration, I cannot say, 'This is bread,' because the real thing or substance is changed; I must say, 'This is the body of Christ.'" To this we may add the following utterances of Dr. Darwell Stone, of the Church of England. He said:

“ The use of Eucharistic vestments marks a common doctrine in regard to the Eucharist in the past and present and in the different parts of the Church today ”; “ a common doctrine that is lawfully held now in the Church of England, and held in the Churches of the East and the Church of Rome.”

The essentially lawless character of this Romeward movement is well exemplified by the attitude its promoters take on the subject of Reservation. Our Bishops in 1895, as I have said, declared that the practice was “ not sanctioned by the law of this church,” but that in cases of “ extreme necessity the Ordinary might authorize the reserved sacrament to be carried to the sick.” In the face of this the weekly organ of the party does not hesitate to say: “ We trust that the rectors of parish churches in Massachusetts and throughout the American Church understand that an Episcopal license is not necessary to enable them to make that absolutely needful provision for communicating the sick and dying.”

Five years after the above utterance of our American Bishops, in the month of May, 1900, the Archbishops of Canterbury and

York (Dr. Temple and Dr. Maclagan) gave their judgment on the question of Reservation, after listening to exhaustive arguments from learned counsel on both sides, and after taking about nine months to consider the subject; and they agreed in deciding that Reservation is not legal in the Church of England.

"I am obliged to decide," said Archbishop Temple, "that the Church of England does not at present allow Reservation in any form." And Archbishop Maclagan said: "I can come to no other decision than that the practice of Reservation has no sanction from the Church of England at the present time, that it was deliberately abandoned at the time of the Reformation, and that it is not lawful for any individual clergyman to resume such practice in ministering to the souls committed to his charge."

Yet the *Living Church* (April 30, 1910) does not scruple to say that "no intelligent person alleges now that the Rubric at the end of the Communion Office has any reference to reservation for the sick," and that "it is part of the legitimate pastoral office of a parish priest to make such arrangement."

“APOSTOLIC, CATHOLIC, REFORMED, PROTESTANT”

There is not one of those words that can be spared. They have a deep meaning for our children, which we should hand down to them to be cherished forever.

ARCHBISHOP BENSON.

I am not one of those who are ashamed of the name of the Church. I expect to live and die under it.

WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON.

The Church is a Reformed Church. The Church is a Protestant Church — emphatically and distinctly such.

JOHN HENRY HOPKINS,
Sometime Bishop of Vermont.

Blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter betwixt the Church of England and her sisters of the Reformation. We accord in every point of Christian doctrine without the least variation; their public confessions and ours are sufficient convictions to the world of our full and absolute agreement. The only difference is in the form of outward administration; wherein we are also so far agreed as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a church, though much importing the well or better being of it.

R.T. REV. JOSEPH HALL, D.D.,
*Bishop of Exeter and Chaplain
to Archbishop Laud.*

III

THE ATTITUDE OF PRAYER BOOK CHURCHMEN TOWARDS THE LATEST PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE NAME OF THE CHURCH

*Republished by permission of The Protestant Episcopal Society for the Promotion
of Evangelical Knowledge*

TO THE MEMORY OF A STAUNCH PROTESTANT AND A GREAT
CHURCHMAN, WM. REED HUNTINGTON

THE question which we propose to discuss in the following pages is this: Why do Prayer Book churchmen, High, Low, and Broad, oppose, as so many of them do, the proposal, nearly successful at Cincinnati, to change the name of the Church?

I. In studying this question we meet on the threshold the important fact that the agitation is not new. It has a history which throws light on its significance. In the General Convention at Boston, in 1877, the famous Dr. DeKoven, of Wisconsin, proposed a Constitutional Commission to consider a change in the legal title of the Church. When it came to a vote, three clergymen were recorded in its favor; no laymen.

Again in 1883, at Philadelphia, Rev. Dr. Thrall, of the Diocese of Springfield, proposed to strike out "Protestant Episcopal" from Prayer Book, Ordinal, Constitution, and Canons. This was defeated by *viva voce* vote. Then, in the General Convention of 1886, Mr. Judd, of Illinois, introduced a resolution proposing that the name "Protestant Episcopal" be expunged from all the laws and formularies of the Church, upon the ground that it was too narrow and exclusive a designation of a branch of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church, misleading to the uninformed, and therefore so far pernicious and harmful. The resolution was defeated. At the next General Convention, in 1889, Mr. Judd brought up the subject again, this time confining his proposition to the title-page of the Prayer Book. Action upon this proposal was postponed. At the next General Convention, in 1892, Mr. Morehouse, of Milwaukee, again introduced the proposal which Mr. Judd had brought in three years before. It was laid on the table. At the next General Convention (1895) a proposition came from the House of Bishops to amend the title-page by leaving out the name "Protestant Epis-

copal Church " and adding " According to the American Use." It was referred to the Committee on the Prayer Book, and a majority of that committee reported it back to the House favorably. There was, however, a minority report which was adverse to the proposal. They said: " We believe . . . that it will tend to alarm the minds and awaken the fears of many of the most loyal members of our communion." The proposition was lost by a large vote. Again, in 1898, the Rev. Dr. Battershall of Albany offered a resolution to strike out " Protestant Episcop al " from the title-page of the Prayer Book. It was referred to the Committee on the Prayer Book, and an unanimous adverse report was made. Yet again, at the General Convention of 1901, the Rev. Mr. Hickman, of Colorado, offered a series of resolutions to strike out the words " Protestant Episcop al Church " from the title-page, from the preface, from the ordinal, from the constitution, and to substitute, as the name of the Church, " The American Catholic Church in the United States." At the same Convention a memorial from the Diocese of Milwaukee was simultaneously introduced in the House

of Bishops and in the House of Deputies, asking that the name of the Church be changed to the "American Catholic Church." It was finally decided, in accordance with a proposal received from the House of Bishops, that a joint committee be appointed, consisting of five Bishops, five Presbyters, and five Laymen, to take the whole subject of change of name of this Church into consideration, to ascertain, as far as possible, the mind of the Church concerning it, and to make report at the next General Convention. The report of this joint committee is found in the Journal of 1904, Appendix XIII, pages 533 to 560 — one of the most elaborate reports ever made by any joint committee in the history of the Church. It appeared that the committee had made most careful and thorough inquiries to ascertain the mind of the Church in the various dioceses and missionary jurisdictions. The result showed an overwhelming majority of the said dioceses and jurisdictions opposed to the proposition, and accordingly the joint committee unanimously reported that "Any change of the name of this Church at this time is inexpedient," and asked to be discharged from the further con-

sideration of the subject. So overwhelming was the sentiment of the Church in opposition to this proposal that even its most determined advocates on the committee did not hesitate to agree to the conclusion just stated. The committee consisted of Bishops Tuttle, Scarborough, Peterkin, Whitehead, and Leonard; and the Rev. Drs. D. H. Greer, G. McC. Fiske, J. H. Eggar, S. S. Moore, B. Talbot Rogers; and Messrs. F. A. Lewis, D. B. Lyman, Joseph Packard, A. J. C. Sowdon, and L. H. Morehouse.

The question was not introduced in either house in the Convention of 1907. That convention is the only one during the last twenty-five years which is thus distinguished. This latest proposal at the Convention of 1910 differs from that of 1904 in this important particular: it was brought forward without previous notice and without any preparation. When it came up in 1904 at Boston, it had been, as I have stated, before the Church for three years, during which careful inquiry had been instituted to ascertain the mind of the Church. But no such preliminary inquiry had been made in this last instance. The dioceses had no notification that such a

proposal was to be made. It was generally supposed that after the overwhelming defeat of the proposition at Boston the subject would be allowed to rest for some years at least, and the deputies went to Cincinnati, not only with no instructions from their dioceses, but without any expectation that such a proposal was to be made. It came like a bolt out of the blue. *In this connection we call attention to the significant fact that upon the one and only occasion when the proposal to change the name of the Church was submitted to the people (namely, in 1904) it was overwhelmingly defeated.*

It is next to be observed that the form of the proposal was quite different from any that preceded it, and especially from those of 1901 and 1904. It was not proposed to call the Church "The American Catholic Church," but the "Episcopal Church." This change, no doubt, accounted for the large favorable vote which it received.

There was, however, one feature which was common to all these various proposals — they all eliminated the word "Protestant." It is this which links the measure of 1910 with all the rest. It is this which identifies it as

belonging to the same family. It is this which certifies us that it was the product of the same spirit. Confirmatory evidence of this is seen in the assurance given his followers by the editor of the *Living Church* that if this proposal were adopted they would secure THE END they had been laboring so many years to attain.

Now, every agitation, political, social, or religious, must be judged in the light of its history. This particular proposal is no exception. As we have said, it is not a new proposition, though it is different in form from its predecessors. It belongs to a well-known family, and in spite of differentiation it has the family likeness clearly marked. It cannot, we think, be questioned that all these measures were primarily inspired by the intense desire to remove the word "Protestant" from the standards of the Church, and not the word only, but the thing, the doctrine which the word connotes. To quote the language of a deceased writer, "It must be quite evident that the end aimed at is to change not merely the name, but the Church itself. Sensible men would not spend time in trying to get the name changed unless the

change meant something. The object of the present movement is not simply to continue the Protestant Episcopal Church as it is, only under a new name, but to make the new name, at least in the popular mind, stand for something which it is claimed the present name does not stand for. A new name means a new Church in some features, relations, conceptions, or ideals."

We do not mean for a moment to say that all those who advocated this proposal at Cincinnati did so from this motive. Some, no doubt, were desirous of the change upon the ground that our present name is, in their opinion, too narrow to be a fit designation of the branch of the one Catholic and Apostolic Church; or that it seems to convey the idea that this Church had its origin in the sixteenth century; or that a larger name might contribute to the great purpose of gathering together in one communion Christian people now divided from one another; or that our present name is an obstacle to successful work among some groups of people from foreign lands, or in the foreign missionary fields. But what we do mean to say is, that from the beginning the leaders

who have so persistently urged this change, pressing it upon the Church at every General Convention but two for the last thirty-three years, are men who frankly avow their dislike and antagonism to Protestantism—name and thing. No one acquainted with their utterances in pulpit and press can fail to acknowledge that those of our brethren who have most persistently and earnestly urged this change are men to whom the word “Protestant,” which to us stands for so much that is great and good, is highly offensive. A writer in the English *Church Review* in 1868 refers to the efforts of the Tractarian party to remove “*the standing disease of Protestantism*” from the Church of England. Thus, even in a Church whose official name does not contain the word “Protestant,” but whose history and standards link it indissolubly to the Protestant Reformation, the men of the so-called Catholic party are intensely solicitous to get rid of its Protestantism. In that same year, 1868, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated that members of that party call the Church of England “a Communion, deeply tainted with Protestant heresy.”

II. But it may be urged that the proposal under discussion has a different color because it was presented, not by the representatives of a single party, but by a composite group. It came into the Convention as the result of "an effort to find common ground" between men holding different views. It was, in short, presented as an eirenicon. Now, we may freely and cordially grant the perfect sincerity of the purpose just stated, and yet we may be compelled to say, with the majority of the Committee on the Prayer Book, that, though intended for peace, it would inevitably result in discord. It is true that the proposal emanated from what has passed into history as "the Round Table Conference."¹ That Conference was composed, at least three parts, of members of the Reactionary party, and one part or less of Broad Churchmen and Low Churchmen. But without laying too much stress upon that

¹ The Round Table Conference was a group of about twenty clergymen and laymen who met for private conference during part of two days before the opening of the General Convention in Cincinnati. It was called by agreement between Mr. F. C. Morehouse, Editor of the *Living Church*, and Rev. Dr. C. B. Wilmer, Rector of St. Luke's Church, Atlanta.

circumstance, it must be said that the proposal cannot be viewed as having its *origin* in the Round Table Conference. That was the channel through which it came to us, but its real spring and source must be traced back a third of a century. The mingling of one or two rills of liberal and conservative influence with the stream cannot really change its character. The fact that there were a few Low Churchmen and Broad Churchmen in the famous Conference cannot alter the broad fact that the strong influence behind the movement was the same which has inspired it ever since first introduced in the General Convention of 1886. We do not violate charity, or lay ourselves open to the charge of stirring up strife, when we lay emphasis on this fact.

To come to the proposal itself, it might appear a very simple thing just to drop the word "Protestant" and let the Church be called, as it is already and popularly called, "The Episcopal Church." What indeed could be easier or simpler or less objectionable? And how much would be gained by it! This ever-recurring agitation would cease!

The “Catholic party” would desist from the long effort to secure the adoption of the name, “The American Catholic Church”! We should have peace! The lion would lie down with the lamb on the broad Chicago-Lambeth platform!

In reply, one must ask what assurance, what guarantee was there that the agitation would really cease? Could those fifteen or twenty men pledge the whole party of which they were members, however earnestly they wished to do so? How could we be certified that in a few years there would not break out an agitation for a broader and better name than “Episcopal”? Indeed, at the time the “Round Table” proposal was brought into the convention the organ of the Reactionary party (Oct. 15, 1910) suggested that it was the best that could be obtained at present; that another generation, wiser and larger-minded, might give us a still better name. There are, it may be added, many indications that it would not have satisfied the extreme party for long. We were told, indeed, at the time of the Convention, that if that proposal were rejected the demand for the American Catholic name could

and would be enforced as a penalty for our Bourbonism.¹

But was it, after all, so simple to erase the word which has for a century and a quarter identified us as holding the great principles of the Protestant Reformation — and to do it at the instance of our brethren who have made us all plainly understand that they repudiate these principles, and think the Protestant name a burden and a reproach? Could we fail to see how great an achievement it would be from the point of view of that party to erase from all the standards of the Church the word which has been so bitter to them ever since the days of John Henry Newman?

As an illustration of the feeling entertained by these our brethren in relation to Protestantism, we may call attention to a recent utterance of “*Presbyter Ignotus*,” the favored weekly correspondent of the

¹ Little’s *Reasons for being a Churchman* is the favorite manual of the advanced party; but the proposal to call our Church “The Episcopal Church” could find no support there; for the author says: “In regard to the other adjective ‘Episcopal,’ while it is true, it is simple tautology; for the word ‘Catholic,’ nay, the very word ‘Church,’ implies all that. One might as well say ‘a vertebrate man,’ or ‘an equine horse,’ or ‘a stellar star,’ as ‘an Episcopal Church’” (page 101, subscription edition, 1910).

Living Church. He couples Protestants with infidels and Romish recusants—"Protestants, Infidels, and Romish Recusants!" The same paper quotes with approval the following from the *Church Times* (London): "It is a grievous trial to English Churchmen to have to speak of a Church with which they are in communion as 'Protestant.' They cannot do so without a serious twinge and a very wry mouth."

III. Now, let it be said in all charity that it is incumbent upon those who are agitating for a change of the name of the Church to give strong and convincing reasons for such a radical proposition. We are not discussing the question of what name we should adopt, but of blotting out a name which was adopted by our forefathers in the eighteenth century, and under which this Church has lived and labored and wonderfully prospered for nearly a century and a quarter. But, more than this, any such change touches the heart of the Church so deeply that, to use the language of the diocese of Louisiana in a resolution adopted in 1904, "A change of this kind is of such significance, that, if ac-

complished, it should be brought about without serious division in the Church and with virtual unanimity." Instead of this unanimity we find the diocese of South Carolina declaring that same year "its unalterable opposition to any change in the name of the Church"; and the diocese of Virginia declaring "that any such action on the part of the General Convention would be unwise, misleading, and revolutionary in its consequences"; and the diocese of Western Massachusetts voting that "a change of the legal name of our Church at this time would be unfortunate; that it would make for discord and not harmony; dissent and not union; sectarianism and not catholicity."

Though these utterances were made in 1904 they nevertheless illustrate the feeling in the Church on the general subject.

It was said, in the organ of the Reactionary party during the General Convention in Cincinnati, "that there was a group of irreconcilables, chiefly men of advanced age, who would obstinately refuse to accept the proposal of the Round Table Conference." But, with all deference, it may be asked who may rightly be called the "irreconcilables"

— those who stand firmly in defense of the name and the principles which the Church adopted at the time of its separation from the Church of England; or those who refuse to reconcile themselves with the Church as it is, with the Church as it has been handed down to us by the fathers, and who have persistently agitated for a fundamental change of its position in every General Convention but two for the last three and thirty years?

It is true, however, that a large body of intelligent and progressive Churchmen could not reconcile themselves to accept the proposal to change the name of the Church in the manner proposed. What were, what are, the reasons which to us seem so decisive against this change?

Well, in the first place, we felt, as just stated, that a very strong case must be made out for changing a name deliberately adopted an hundred and twenty-five years ago — a name that had been in use as descriptive of the Church of England at least a century and a quarter before it was adopted by Bishop White and his co-laborers — a name truly descriptive on the one hand of the primitive polity of the Church and on the

other of its adherence to Protestant truth — a name, moreover, which is associated with a more than Hundred Years' War for the pure Gospel of Christ and for Catholic doctrine and order in this Western world. But when we came to examine the arguments adduced in favor of the change we found them, to our thinking, wholly inconclusive.

Elsewhere we have taken up these arguments in detail and given our reasons for rejecting them.¹ We will not go over the same ground in this Essay. It will be enough here to state two principal reasons why we are unalterably opposed to this change. The one grows out of the relation of the proposal to Christian unity; the other out of its relation to primitive and Catholic truth.

Now, as to the first, we are unable to resist the conviction that the consummation of this project would have been a distinct and serious injury to that Christian unity which is so dear to our hearts and whose footsteps we have seemed faintly to hear approaching — though at a long distance. It would have alienated the great Protestant churches from us; for this word “Protestant,” which has

¹ See chapter iv of this volume.

been characterized as a divisive, a sectarian, word, forms in reality a strong bond of union between our primitive and Catholic Church and those great Protestant communions around us, which, like ourselves, owe so much to the Protestant Reformation. We gladly recognize our kinship with them. They are our brethren. We hold in common with them, not only the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds, but many of those truths which were vindicated at the Reformation, both in England and on the Continent.

Much opprobrium has been cast by the Reactionary party upon the word "Protestant." It has been called that truculent word, that word of division and strife and negation, that word that connotes reckless and irresponsible individualism, a word that may mean a "go as you please religion" or no religion at all.

Nevertheless it is a great and noble word. We are not ashamed of it. We do not apologize for it. It has a great history. It stands for illustrious achievement. It has been the fountain of liberty, of progress, of intellectual and spiritual enlightenment, and of missionary achievement. "A word of divi-

sion " indeed! Why, it is the bond of union between twenty millions of Christians in our Fatherland! " A word of negation," do they say? Why, it is one of the most positive and constructive words in the language! Its etymology and its history alike proclaim it such. It is older than the Reformation, older than the Primitive Church. It came, in Greek form, from the lips of Jesus of Nazareth when at Pilate's judgment seat He said: "*To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world that I should bear witness unto the truth*" (John xviii. 37).

The word " Protestant " is derived from the Latin " protestari," which means " to bear solemn witness," the thing which our Lord told Pilate He came into the world to do, and which He did, both positively and negatively; positively by witnessing to the truth of the Gospel, and negatively by bearing witness against the traditions of the Pharisees by which they " made the word of God of none effect." Was not this, by the way, in striking analogy to the witness of the Reformers of the sixteenth century both positively for the Gospel as once delivered to the

Saints, and negatively against the perversion of the word of God by Tradition? We note also that the witness-bearing of the Apostles is described frequently in the Book of Acts by the compound of the same word our Saviour used to Pilate — the word *διαμαρτύρομαι*, which means “to solemnly affirm,” “to call God and man to witness” — the very thing the Protestant princes did at Speyer — and this is rendered in the Vulgate (Acts xx. 23) by the Latin word “protestari.”

Thus, etymologically, both in Latin and Greek, “Protestant” is a word of affirmation, not of negation. The same is true of its meaning as shown in the best English lexicons. It means “to make a solemn declaration or affirmation; to bear witness or testimony to; to assert; to asseverate; to declare”; and again “to affirm with solemnity, to make a solemn declaration of a fact or opinion.” The negative meaning is secondary and derivative.

Observe also that our word “martyr” comes from the Greek word used by our Lord in His interview with Pilate, *μαρτυρέω*. A martyr is a witness for the truth — for Christ — and its Latin equivalent is “testis,” from which “Protestant” is derived.

Thus the Fathers of the Nicene Age were Protestants for the truth of the divinity of Christ against the false doctrine of Arius. And so, when the sixteenth century came, Luther and his co-workers on the Continent, and Cranmer and his fellow reformers in England, were Protestants for the ancient, primitive, and Catholic truths of the Christian religion, against the corruptions and perversions of the truth which in the course of ages had fastened themselves upon the Church.

A Protestant Church is a witnessing Church, a martyr Church.

As to the history of the word, our space allows but a few words. The Protest at Speyer has been described by a clergyman, yes, a *clergyman*, who should be an educated man, as “simply a political conspiracy”!¹ What are the facts? The princes, members of the Diet, who had embraced the Reformed doctrines, drew up, April 19, 1529, a *Protestation*, and, further, on the 22d, an *Instrumentum Appellationis*, presenting their Protest with greater completeness.

¹ *Living Church*, Jan. 21, 1911, p. 401.

Now, what was the significance of these documents? Well, in the first place they did not protest against the doctrines of the Roman Church, or indeed against anything. Their Protest was wholly positive: "They came forward with a solemn positive protestation, before God and the Empire, that they had acted in obedience to what they believed to be the teaching of the Word of God, which was the Supreme Authority, and in accordance with their conscience." This was their language. "In matters which concern God's honor and the salvation and eternal life of our souls every one must stand and give account before God for himself." "In matters of conscience there can be no question of majorities." Herein, be it observed, the essence of Protestantism consists.¹

This was the initial chapter in the history of modern Protestantism. Another chapter was written in the English Reformation, and there too it stood, not for negation, but for assertion, for solemn, positive protestation before God and man for the sacred rights of the individual conscience, and for the reas-

¹ See *Principles of the Reformation*, by the Very Rev. Henry Wace, D.D., Dean of Canterbury, pp. 13-17, 1910.

sertion and re-establishment of primitive and Catholic truth. The English Reformation was a return to the purer faith and practice of the early age of Christianity.

Now, there was much in common between the English and the Continental Reformers. The Augsburg confession of faith and our XXXIX Articles are closely akin. And the Protestant churches on the Continent were in large sympathy with the English Church.

This sympathy continued in the seventeenth century. Thus the great Bishop, John Cosin, though a very High Churchman, wrote: "In heart and affection we enjoy constant union with all the other Churches on earth which bear the title of Christian, and profess the Catholic faith and religion. . . . We desire this to be particularly understood as referring to the Protestant Churches" (*Regni Angliae Religio*, XIV).¹ The great divines of the Church of England were at one with the famous word of St. Irenæus, "*Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is the Catholic Church.*"

Thus this great word, witnessing to Chris-

¹ Bishop Cosin was called by Fuller "the Atlas of the Protestant Religion" among the Royalist exiles in France.

tian liberty, witnessing to those primitive and Catholic truths which were reasserted by the Reformers, both on the Continent and in England, constitutes a sacred bond between the great Evangelical churches of America and ourselves—those churches which embrace at least five sixths of the Protestant world in this land, which are the chief moral sinew and strength of our American civilization, which are the bulwarks of our country against the aggressions of the Roman Catholic hierarchy, and which are doing such a magnificent missionary work in Pagan lands.

Now, we refuse our consent to the proposal to strike out the word “Protestant,” because it would mean nothing less than the severing of that bond between us and these great Protestant churches. We believe with absolute conviction that the day that proposal should be carried into effect the hands on the clock of Christian Unity would be put back a long, long way. But, please God, that day shall never come!

It was urged indeed by the distinguished laymen who led the debate on that side at Cincinnati, that our present name divides us

from the Protestant communions around us, and that if we would eliminate the objectionable word from our standards it would mark a step forward in the direction of Christian Unity that would be "really worth while." This argument would have powerfully appealed to us if we could have believed it sound. But that we could not believe. When indeed we heard it so persuasively presented, we wondered if our ears did not deceive us. What? Strike out the word "Protestant" — and so get into closer union and sympathy with the great Protestant churches around us! Doubtless some paradoxes veil great truths, but this assuredly was not one of them! The real truth in this matter reveals itself in the recent utterance of one of the zealous advocates of this change. He said: "To dissociate ourselves in the popular mind from those who profess and call themselves Protestants nowadays is the chief reason why we want the change of name" (*Living Church*, Dec. 24, 1910).

The other chief reason for the opposition of Prayer Book Churchmen to this proposed change was that they saw in it an assault upon the doctrinal position of the Prayer

Book — upon those primitive and Catholic truths which were restored to the standards of the Anglican Church by and through the Reformation. We oppose the movement to surrender our Protestant name because it would be one more step — and a long one — towards surrendering the Protestant doctrine which the name stands for. And we resist the abandonment of our Protestant doctrine, because only by holding it fast can we continue truly Catholic. The Reformers said to the champions of the Church of Rome: “ You have corrupted the Catholic Faith; you have overlaid the word of God by your traditions; in repudiating your authority and renouncing your peculiar doctrines we are returning to the Catholic Church.” We say the same to this Reactionary party.

That this movement to change the name of the Church is the result of the movement which has been in progress ever since the Tractarian party was launched is “ writ large ” on its history, and he must be blind indeed, or exceeding simple, who does not see it. This undeniable fact supplies the most powerful reason why so many Prayer

Book Churchmen are unalterably opposed to it.

To this we shall advert at a later stage of our essay.

IV. But we turn to another aspect of the subject. It is objected by some of our brethren who were active in drawing up the proposal presented at Cincinnati that we fail to recognize the true character of this movement, which, they insist, is differentiated from all that preceded it in this important particular: they were partisan, this is eirenic, comprehensive; this put forward a platform "which unequivocally pledged the 'Catholic' party to the results of the Reformation in the Church of England."

This claim is based on the Joint Resolutions which were brought forward simultaneously with the proposal to change the name of the Church, and which affirmed "that by such change there was intended no changed relationship . . . towards principles established by or through the Reformation of the Church of England as those principles are enshrined in the book of Common

Prayer." Moreover, so it was claimed, the so-called "Catholic party" further pledged itself to stand squarely on the Quadrilateral: and thus "two, if not three parties, which had been steadily fighting each other" were to be united. Surely here was a consummation devoutly to be wished; why then should not the measure have been gladly welcomed by all who desired the unity and prosperity of the Church?

Now, we made no doubt of the perfect sincerity and good faith of those who made this proposal, but we could not accept it, for two reasons. First, because the declaration that no change was *intended* toward the principles of the Reformation as enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer could not alter the fact that the elimination of the word "Protestant" from all the standards and formularies of the Church would be understood—and naturally understood—by our own people and by the Christian world at large as marking an abandonment of the thing signified by the name as well as the name itself. We were bound to consider the effect of this action upon the rank and file of the Church, especially in the older dioceses where the

principles of the Protestant Reformation were strongly held; and we could not doubt what that effect would be — to use the language of the Resolution adopted by the Diocese of Indianapolis in 1904 — “*any change* would bring distress to many loyal adherents”; or again, to use the language of the Diocese of Massachusetts, “A change of the legal name of our Church at this time would be unfortunate — it would make for discord and not harmony, dissension and not union, sectarianism and not Catholicity.”

We were bound also to consider how this change would be interpreted by the great Protestant communions of America, to whom we are closely bound in the sympathy of the common Faith, and to whom we must look for the first practical possible approach to Christian Unity; and we could not doubt, as we have shown above, that they would understand such a change to mean the weakening of the bond which unites us with them and with the Reformation — in spite of all the Joint Resolutions that could be adopted to the contrary.

And then, secondly, we were quite unable to see how the adoption of the said Joint

Resolutions would "unite the two parties that had been steadily fighting each other." The agreement of the so-called "Catholic" party to accept the Resolution that the obliteration of the Protestant name from the Standards of the Church was not intended to indicate any changed relationship to the principles established by the Reformation could not constitute any stronger pledge of loyalty to the Reformed Prayer Book than every presbyter of this Church has already given in his ordination: when he called God to witness that he would "always so minister the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of Christ . . . *as this Church hath* received the same." Has not every clergyman who has made that vow already "unequivocally pledged himself to the results of the Reformation in the Church of England"? And can a Joint Resolution of the General Convention add to the binding force of our ordination vows? Is a Joint Resolution more solemn, more sacrosanct, than those tremendous obligations we entered into at that most solemn moment of our lives? If the individual resolution and vow assumed in the Ordination Service has not secured our loyalty to

the Reformation, what hope is there of securing it by a Joint Resolution?

Bearing these things in mind, we could not see that the proposal at Cincinnati gave any fresh guarantee of fidelity to the Reformation.

And as to the undertaking to stand squarely on the Lambeth Quadrilateral, has not the whole Church stood on that platform since the House of Bishops unanimously passed the Resolutions embodying it? Has it not been recognized as the position of the Church ever since? Can it be that while holding it out to the Christian world as the basis of unity for now twenty-four years, we have all along not been committed to it ourselves, but need to ratify it by a Joint Resolution?

The point just discussed has been much insisted on by the organ of the Reactionary party in the Church. The proposal at Cincinnati has been described as “an effort to knit together the factions in the Church,” and “an attempt to find common ground on questions long at issue, by means of a reasonable compromise of varying views” (*Living Church*, Dec. 31, 1910); and again “as an attempted solution of long standing

problems, which at times had almost disrupted the Church" (*Living Church*, Jan. 21, 1911). And then the refusal of the Prayer-Book party to accept these proposals and to agree to this happy solution of the problems which have threatened the unity of the Church is commented on with no little severity. We are condemned as "absolutely unaffected by the desire for unity . . . not even able to act generously toward those who had set such high ideals before the Convention — a party of absolutely irreconcilable partisanship" (*Ibid.*, Dec. 31). And so by our narrowness and partisanship a great "opportunity to unite the Church was thrown away."

Now, this is a very grave charge indeed, and, if it can be substantiated, reflects serious discredit on those who opposed the measures referred to. But is it substantiated?

So far as the proposal to change the name of the Church is concerned, what was offered us was a compromise in appearance only. The Bishop of West Virginia has pointed this out very clearly. He says: "The party of change proposes to give up a name which they have not got, and asks as a concession

that the party opposed to change give up one they securely hold, and which is hallowed by the association of more than a hundred years. Such a transaction as is thus indicated cannot be described as a compromise; if we want to be accurate, we must call it an unconditional surrender."

And then as to the Joint Resolutions; it is really amazing that any one should describe them as "an attempted solution of long standing problems which, at times, had almost disrupted the Church."

They refer to the Quadrilateral — that is, the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith; the Apostles' and Nicene Creed as the sufficient summary of Christian doctrine; the three-fold ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons; and the Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself.

Now are these the subjects "which have almost disrupted the Church"? Have the controversies of the last thirty or forty years raged round these matters? Has the contention between Prayer-Book Churchmen and the Reactionary party related to the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures as the standard of faith; or the three-fold ministry; or the

two ancient creeds; or the reverent observance of the Sacraments ordained by Christ?

We had supposed that, speaking generally, these were the subjects Churchmen were agreed upon; and that the problem had been to prevail upon our brethren of other communions to accept them as the basis of the reunion of Christendom. Of course there have always been questions and differences of opinion as to certain aspects of these four fundamentals, but they are not the subjects which have seriously divided Churchmen these forty years past, and threatened the unity of the Body of Christ. Let it be said, and said without fear of successful contradiction, that the Joint Resolutions had nothing whatever to do with the principal issues which have sharply divided Churchmen and endangered the peace of the Church. Let it be said, also, that those Resolutions presented no common ground for the settlement of the acute differences between factions in the Church, and offered no solution of the long-standing problems between them. And finally let it be said that to seek to fasten upon the conservatives the charge of "irreconcilable

partisanship " because they declined these proposals is one of the most astounding *non sequiturs* in the history of controversy.

V. And now, to sum up the whole discussion, we invite attention to the fact that the matter of changing the name of the Church is only a superficial aspect of the real question which underlies the whole controversy. It has been stated, as already pointed out by the organ of the Reactionary party, that " substantially THE END " which they have had in view in all this agitation for the past three and thirty years would have been accomplished if the name proposed at Cincinnati had been adopted.¹ *In other words, their supreme concern all these years has been not to get the term "CATHOLIC" or "AMERICAN CATHOLIC" into the name of the Church, but to get the term "PROTESTANT" out!* And why has this been a consummation so devoutly to be wished, so persistently to be pressed? It is no breach of charity to say it is because they have abandoned the doctrines which the word "Protestant" stands for, and are desirous of getting rid of a name

¹ *Living Church*, Oct. 15, 1910.

which no longer expresses the position they occupy.¹

Let us brush aside all the logomachy and all the irrelevant arguments with reference to the meaning of Protestant and Protestantism, and come to the gist and heart of the thing. As to what really matters, we opine that the Reactionary party and the Prayer-Book party are, after all, in essential agreement. To us the word connotes the doctrine of justification by faith, and not by works; the absolute supremacy of the Holy Scriptures as the Rule of Faith; the one Mediatorship of Jesus Christ, to the exclusion of all saints and angels; the office of the ministers of Christ as His ambassadors and representatives, as ministers of reconciliation, and not a sacrificing priesthood, not a sacerdotal caste, not an order of men standing between the people and Christ, as a necessary medium and communication with Him. It connotes also that the ordinance instituted by Christ

¹ It is strangely overlooked by those who urge that we must abandon the term "Protestant" because the word has changed its signification, that they have no more right to assume an ideal and expurgated sense of the term "Catholic" than we have to assume such a sense for the word "Protestant."

on the last evening of His life is the Lord's Supper, the Holy Communion, and not the Sacrifice of the Mass, in which the priest makes a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of men. Thus it connotes not only liberty of conscience, but the right of direct access of the human soul to Christ without the mediation of a priesthood. In a word, it means that system of primitive and Catholic truth which was reasserted in the English Reformation and embodied in the Liturgy and Articles of the English Church.

Now, is it not clear that Protestantism, on its doctrinal side, means the same thing to the so-called "Catholic" party? Do they not reject all, or nearly all, these things which to us are connoted by the word, and assert and practice their contraries?

The organ of that party has, very recently, championed the following doctrines and practices: Sacramental Confession (that is, the Sacrament of Penance), the Objective Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Elements on the Altar, the Sacrifice of the Mass, Eucharistic Adoration, Reservation, Seven Sacraments.¹ *All these things are*

¹ *Living Church*, Feb. 11, 1911, p. 486.

openly professed and practiced by the party; and all these things without exception were cast out of the English Liturgy and omitted from the English Standards of doctrine at the Reformation.

So, then, here the “Reactionary party” and ourselves are really in agreement as to the doctrinal content of the word “Protestant.” It means the affirmation of the doctrines which are challenged by the things above enumerated. That is, *au fond*, the reason *they* want to get rid of it, and *we* want to retain it. Candor must compel us all to agree to that proposition. When the organ of that party tells us that they cannot “suffer the sixteenth century to dominate the twentieth century”—they “cannot be shackled to the skeleton of the sixteenth century,”—that is what is really meant.

But while our opponents will admit that they stand for the doctrines and practices just enumerated, they will vigorously deny that they are unlawful—outside the pale of the comprehensiveness of the Anglican Church. They even assert that Sacerdotalism is equivalent to Prayer-Book Churchmanship, whereas in the Prayer Book proper

(outside of the Institution Office which is only an exceptional occasional office — optional, not obligatory; which was not adopted until the year 1804, and which cannot reverse the doctrinal position of the Prayer Book and Articles) there is no countenance whatever given to Sacerdotalism, properly so called. (We do not refer to the wider and looser acceptance of the term “ sacerdotalism ” — the representative office of the minister. What we deny is that his office is *vicarial*.) We do not know whether the advanced party claim that their system can be squared with the Articles of Religion. Dr. Newman indeed made the attempt in 1841 to show that these can be reconciled with the decrees of the Council of Trent; but the attempt was a dismal failure, as he himself afterwards acknowledged.

We, on our part, maintain that these doctrines and practices are foreign to the whole Anglican System, as finally settled at the Reformation, and we appeal not only to the decisions of the Ecclesiastical Courts, but to the teaching of the great Anglican divines in support of our contention. We challenge our friends of the other side to show any sup-

port for these anti-Protestant doctrines and practices in the writings of even the most High Church School of divines — the divines of the Caroline period, known as the Anglo-Catholic divines.¹ And so we maintain that this system has no doctrinal root in the English Church at any period prior to the Tractarian movement, and we therefore say it is a new theology, un-Anglican as well as un-Protestant, mediæval in form and in substance. This contention of ours is incidentally confirmed by the fact that this party of reaction turns longingly back to the First Prayer Book of Edward VI, and unhesitatingly declares that the changes made in that in Elizabeth's reign, and embodied substantially in our American Prayer Book, were departures from the true principles of Anglicanism. In England many of them speak contemptuously of those who insist on loyalty to the Prayer Book, calling them "Prayer-bookey." In this country they openly advocate and practice (to take one example only of lawlessness) Reservation of the elements, — in the face of the Rubric, in the face of the Article, in the face of the counsel of the House

¹ See chapter viii of this volume.

of Bishops in 1895, and in the face of the decision of the two Archbishops in England in 1901, after a long and exhaustive argument on both sides, and long and painstaking consideration by their Graces: in the face also of the fact that the whole body of the English Bishops united in a Pastoral exhorting the clergy to conform to the decision.

CONCLUSION

The Evangelical Knowledge Society was organized more than sixty years ago for the purpose of maintaining and setting forth the principles and doctrines of the Gospel embodied in the Book of Common Prayer. Rightly, therefore, it comes forward now in defense of that system of Protestant truth which that standard embodies. It is the very gospel itself which is imperiled by the agitation which we have discussed in these pages. That it is revolutionary in character it is impossible to doubt. It seeks to change fundamentally the character of the Church of which we are members. When we scrutinize its features we recognize it as the child of a movement which seeks to reverse the Refor-

mation, and to restore the chief doctrines and practices which were cast out of the Anglican Church at that time.

The Archbishops of the Church of England and many of the most illustrious of her Bishops during the last thirty years have not hesitated to describe this movement as a deliberate attempt to undo the work of the Reformation.

As we ponder the whole subject, the question forces itself upon us — and a very solemn question it is — How long can this beloved Church continue half Protestant and half anti-Protestant?

IV

THE POSITIVE AND PERMANENT VALUE OF PROTESTANTISM

IN extending the hospitality of its columns to Bishop Peterkin's open letter, the editor of one of our Church papers recently said: "It is by such frank interchange of thought as this that Churchmen are brought closer together and are enabled to understand each other." It is on this principle that I venture to ask the attention of my fellow Churchmen of all schools to a plain statement of the position and views of those among us who believe that we should not surrender our Protestant principles or our Protestant name.

Let me first state affirmatively our position. We believe in the continuity of the Church from Apostolic times to our own. We believe that the Protestant Episcopal Church is the daughter and the heir of the Anglican Church and as such is a part of the Holy Catholic Church.

The Church of England today is the same Church that existed in the British Isles centuries before Augustine and his monks landed in Kent in the year 596. After long centuries of bondage under the Roman yoke, it threw off that yoke and asserted its freedom in the sixteenth century. But not only that: it also cast out certain false doctrines and practices which had grown up like tares among the wheat in the course of the centuries. Yet, to use the simile of Bishop Jeremy Taylor, as a garden is the same garden after it has been weeded as before, so the Church of England was the same Church after the noxious weeds of mediæval growth had been uprooted and cast out. That weeding was the work of the Protestant Reformation. It was a supremely important work. It meant the recovery of liberty and the re-establishment of the purity of the primitive faith.

Now the English Prayer Book and Articles of religion are the permanent expression of that work of reformation. We hold to them as the authorized standards of the Church. They may be revised and altered, but until that is done, they remain the authoritative standards to which we are bound to conform.

We hold to the principles of the Protestant Reformation, and to the word "Protestant," as expressive of them, because they were incorporated into the standards of the Church, not as new truths, but as old truths vindicated, as primitive doctrines restored.

In doing this we no more affirm that the English Church was begun in the sixteenth century than we declare the ancient Church was begun at Nicæa because we hold to the Nicene faith. All Churchmen, we believe, still describe themselves as men who hold the Nicene faith, a title that takes us back to one epoch and one part only of the past history of the Church. And why? Because the Church must perpetually witness to the divinity of Christ and to the truth of the Holy Trinity as against all forms of doctrine that deny it. Precisely on the same principle, we call ourselves "Protestants," because the Church must perpetually witness to the great truths which the Reformation asserted, and against those errors which it repudiated.

In doing so we are not tying ourselves to a dead past; we are not antagonizing progress; we are not fettering thought to the

precise opinions of that age. But our twentieth century structure is built upon the work of the sixteenth century, as that is built upon the first century. We are loyal to the eternal law of progress, which is development according to type. True progress will always conserve the type. For example, the chrysanthemum has been marvelously developed in our generation in forms of wondrous beauty, but always according to type. The chrysanthemum never becomes a rose. We believe the Reformation in the sixteenth century re-established the true type of Church doctrine and practice; and hence the progress and advance and development of the twentieth century should be according to that type. Accordingly we hold to Protestant principles and to the Protestant name, because we believe them fundamental and primitive — a restoration of the most ancient doctrine and practice of the Catholic Church. This was the ground taken by the English Church from the Reformation down to the period of the Oxford Tracts. Those illustrious Bishops — Jewel, Andrewes, Jeremy Taylor, Hall, Cosin, Beveridge, Bramhall, Ussher, and Pierson — did not repudiate the

Protestant position of the Church of England. On the contrary, they justified it, they defended it, they gloried in it. The Reformation was in their eyes a purification that had become imperative in order to save Catholic truth. As Jeremy Taylor puts it, "The Church of England looked in the glass of Scripture and pure antiquity, and washed away those stains with which time and inadvertency and tyranny had besmeared her." Even Archbishop Laud held to that "true Protestant religion established in the Church of England."

The editor of the *Churchman* has recently said: "All of us should want to be faithful to the Reformation, where the Reformation has to teach us faithfulness to Christ." That principle completely justifies our Protestant position, for the Reformation teaches us faithfulness to Christ — first, in restoring His Word as the supreme authority of faith and practice rather than tradition; secondly, in proclaiming to men the right of direct access to Jesus Christ without the intervention of a priesthood; thirdly, in declaring and pronouncing to men the certainty of absolution of their sin upon the sole condition

of sincere repentance without requiring or recommending confession to a human priest, save in very exceptional cases; fourthly, in proclaiming the sole mediatorship of Jesus Christ without intervention of saints or angels; fifthly, in teaching a spiritual real presence instead of a carnal real presence in the Holy Communion — the presence of Christ in the heart of the worshiper rather than in the material elements of the Communion; sixthly, in reflecting the teaching of the New Testament and the primitive Church that the Lord's Supper was instituted as a perpetual memory of Christ's sacrifice on the cross — "for the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ" — and not as a repetition of the sacrifice, or a re-presentation of that sacrifice — in a word, that the Lord's Supper is the Holy Communion and not the Sacrifice of the Mass, in which the priest offers the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Christ on the altar as a sacrifice for the sins of men; and finally, the Reformation teaches faithfulness to Christ in affirming the doctrine of the Holy Spirit and the necessity of conversion and of the grace and guidance of

God the Holy Ghost, in the Christian life, from the beginning to the end.

In all these respects Protestantism stands for *positive* and *permanent* and *primitive principles* of Christian faith and practice. This great historic word “Protestant” thus stands for liberty of conscience and purity of doctrine, and to us it is as clear as light that it cannot be blotted out of the Prayer Book without repudiating the doctrines which it connotes, without repudiating the splendid history for which it stands, without confessing that the Reformation was a mistake, if not a crime — without, in fact, destroying the basis upon which this Church and the Church of England rest. So far, then, from being a mere negative word, a word of division, a sectarian word, we maintain that the word “Protestant” is a positive word, a word of affirmation. Thus St. Paul used it (“I protest, . . . I die daily,” 1 Cor. xv. 31), “a noble word, more hallowed by high and sacred associations, and representing greater victories for God’s truth and human righteousness and progress in modern times than any other word which can be named.”

We maintain also that *it registers the*

divine notes of the Church. It stands for the independence and freedom of the Episcopate.¹ It stands for the open Bible. It stands for the supremacy and authority of Holy Scripture, as the final standard of Christian life and doctrine. It stands for the purity of the faith once delivered to the saints. It stands for the primitive faith of the Church as against those corrupt doctrines and practices which were thrown off in the sixteenth century.

Of course the word “Protestant” has also a negative meaning. In the nature of the case, the affirmation of a truth necessarily implies the denial of its corresponding error. This negative meaning is only the other side of the shield. In affirming the great positive truths of Christianity above enumerated, Protestantism necessarily denies the errors which those truths repudiate.

But we are told we must abandon the word “Protestant” because it is changed in its signification. We deny that this is true in anything like the degree to which it is asserted. But independently of this, it is a grievous mistake to abandon a great word,

¹ Roman Episcopacy is fettered by the Papacy.

because it has been abused. Our friends of the other side cling, as we do, to the use of the word "Catholic," although that word has surely been much more grievously abused than has the word "Protestant." If those who urge this reason for abandoning the word "Protestant" are consistent, then they should urge that we cease to call ourselves Christians, because Mormons and Dowieites and Eddyites and others also call themselves Christians.

Thus Protestant principles have a positive and permanent value. They do not represent a passing phase of sixteenth century controversy, but are expressive of fundamental truths, which must be maintained by the Church — which have, in fact, been incorporated in the warp and woof of the liturgical and doctrinal standards of the Anglican Church. These principles in their broad outlines have been maintained by English theologians from the middle of the sixteenth century down to the period of the Oxford Tracts.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH HAS A DEFINITE
STANDARD OF DOCTRINE

Some prominent writers of the present day seem entirely to overlook this fact. They speak as if the Anglican Church had no definite standard of doctrine and practice. They appeal to what they call the world-wide tradition of the Church — which in practice means that every individual clergyman may pick and choose opinions and practices from the wide field of many centuries and adopt them as part of what he recognizes as Catholic truth. These writers express surprise that we should “seriously quote these theological writers of three or four centuries ago, as though they settled something for us.” They affirm that no greater authority attaches to the views of Hooker or Jeremy Taylor than to the views of Stephen Langton or Thomas à Becket or Thomas Aquinas or St. Anselm.¹ They affirm that the divines

* Yet the Bishops of our Church have directed for generations that Hooker should be carefully studied by all our theological students, as our typical divine; and Pope Leo XIII gave orders that Thomas Aquinas should be studied as the typical divine of the Church of Rome.

of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries are just as authoritative as those of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Now, is there not here a serious confusion of thought? We appeal to the divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as witnesses, not as authorities, as witnesses to what was understood in their day to be the teaching of the Anglican Church, precisely as we appeal to the ancient fathers, not as authorities, but as witnesses of the practice and doctrine of the Primitive Church. Thomas à Becket and St. Anselm cannot be witnesses of the accepted doctrines of the Church of England in the sixteenth century. It will not do to write as if the Reformation had never taken place. We were told at Cincinnati by those who advocated dropping the word "Protestant" from the name of the Church, that they were prepared to vote for a resolution affirming their unchanged adherence to the principles established at the Reformation.

Now, where are we to go to find the principles established at the Reformation? Surely to the Prayer Book and the Articles of the English Church; and if we wish to

know in what sense the doctrines therein contained were held, to whom should we appeal except to the great writers of that and the subsequent generation, who with great learning and zeal expounded the principles and doctrines of the English Church?

Until recently this has been acknowledged by all parties in the Church. Indeed, as late as Feb. 11, 1911, the editor of the *Living Church* wrote: “When Dr. McKim made the sweeping statement that neither Eucharistic Adoration, nor Sacramental Confession, nor the Objective Presence, nor the Sacrifice of the Mass, nor Reservation, nor Seven Sacraments can claim the support of Bishop Beveridge, Bishop Overall, or Bishop Andrewes, or Bishop Cosin, or Bishop Jeremy Taylor, or Bishop Bramhall, or Bishop Hall, it became necessary, obviously, to devote a considerable amount of space to the rebuttal, and we are indebted to those correspondents who have painstakingly cited the evidence from these writers to show that Dr. McKim is mistaken.” This editorial was in print before my replies to those correspondents appeared — in which I was able to show that

I was completely justified in the statement that I had made.¹ Since my demonstration of that fact, we have begun to hear that the opinions of the Anglo-Catholic divines were not of great moment after all!

Again, is there not confusion of thought in saying that the Catholic party in the Church claims “the full perspective of nineteen centuries of Christian experience”? We Protestants may equally claim it, as recognizing the Christian character and example of the saints of all ages, irrespective of their theological errors and limitations. We claim Luther and Melanchthon as well as Stephen Langton and St. Anselm, as representative Christian men, but we do not accept any of them as exponents of the doctrinal position of the Church of England. We might go so far as to say, with one of the early fathers, that “Socrates and Plato were Christians before Christ,” but we do not appeal to these sages as witnesses of the doctrine of the Church of England.

¹ See chapter viii of this volume.

THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY UPHEAVAL RESTORED
THE PRIMITIVE TYPE

The editor of the *Living Church* says of the English Church: "If it be the same Church, there cannot possibly be any legal principle whereby it be lawful to appeal to its acts or history in one period and not in another period" (Oct. 21, 1911, p. 832).

Was there, then, no such thing as the Reformation in the sixteenth century, and may a member of the Church of England appeal to the doctrines and practices prevailing in the Church of England in the ages before the Reformation, even though these doctrines and practices were repudiated and authoritatively cast out of the formularies of the Church of England at that epoch? In the light of these utterances by one of the most distinguished and influential leaders of the Neo-Catholic party, what value can be attached to the pledge given at Cincinnati, that the Catholic party would adopt a platform which should unequivocally pledge them to the results of the Reformation in the Church

of England as they are enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer? According to the dictum just quoted, nothing was settled at the Reformation; no results were enshrined authoritatively in the Book of Common Prayer; and whatever was believed or practiced in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in the Church of England has just as good a right to be considered authoritative, as the doctrines established and enshrined in the Prayer Book at the Reformation.

Such principles reduce the doctrines of the Church to a nose of wax — they may mean anything or nothing. The solemn promise subscribed by every Bishop, Priest, and Deacon at the time of his ordination, namely: “I do solemnly engage to conform to the doctrine, form, and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America,” ceases to have any definite meaning under this interpretation; and all the elaborate provisions for making sure that no one shall be ordained who has written, taught, or held anything contrary to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of this Church, are reduced to a farce, since upon

110 CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

these principles the Church has no definite doctrine.¹

¹ Of this appeal to Catholic Tradition the late Bishop Mandell Creighton wrote: "The Resolutions practically assume that out of the vast museum of ecclesiastical antiquities of the past, every priest has a right to choose what he likes, and to carry it into practice, provided he can find an adequate body of people who agree with him. This is subversive of all principles of unity and of government" (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 354).

The Bishop thought that the "Catholic" party, in their zeal for what they called the Catholic Church, lost sight of the real meaning of the Church of England. He said of them: "They do not care for the Church of England" (*Ibid.*, pp. 285, 286).

V

DOES PROTESTANTISM SPELL PARTISANSHIP?

1. THE term “Protestant” not partisan, but inclusive.

Some of those who differ from us charge us with partisanship because of our opposition to the change of the name of the Church. But are we justly liable to such a charge because we resolutely oppose the abandonment of the Protestant part of the name of our Church? If it be true, as it is, that for three hundred years after the readjustment of the position of the Church at the Reformation, men of all schools of churchmanship, including the highest Churchmen of the Caroline period, avowed themselves Protestants, it would seem that the term “Protestant” is an inclusive term, embracing all schools of thought in the Church of England, at least down to the time of the Tractarian upheaval. This conclusion is emphasized by the fact that so many of the most illustrious leaders in the Church of England, although pro-

nounced High Churchmen, have continued to avow themselves Protestants.

It is enough to refer to Archbishop Benson and Bishop Mandell Creighton. The former said that “the word ‘Protestant’ could not be spared, because it has a deep meaning for our children, which we should hand down to them to be cherished forever,” and the latter, though on great occasions he was accustomed to wear the cope and mitre, over and over again identified himself as a Protestant. Thus, referring to his difficulty in understanding Lord Acton’s review of his book, he says: “The difference between a Catholic and a Protestant is enormous, when they try to understand each other. It is like a Jew and a Christian talking of the Messiah” (*Life*, vol. i. p. 229).

Again, writing to a friend about his history of the papacy, he says: “My Protestantism will be more obvious in succeeding volumes” (vol. i. p. 231).

Yet again, writing to Dr. Kolde, in Germany, he says: “We Protestants” (vol. ii. p. 88).

It is not, then, as Low Churchmen or as Broad Churchmen that we are so solicitous

not to erase the Protestant name from our escutcheon; but as Churchmen, whether high or low or broad, maintaining the historic position of the Anglican Church. It seems to us that a word which has for nearly four hundred years, and down to the present day, embraced the three great historical schools of the Church should be considered an inclusive word, embracing all the distinctive principles emphasized in the Reformation settlement. We ask our friends to give candid consideration to the fact alluded to.

It is said, indeed, that the word “Protestant” has sadly degenerated in meaning in the last hundred years. One of our Bishops writes: “Two hundred sects appear in the religious census of Protestants. We find ourselves in strange and certainly objectionable company; we are in the same class with beloved brethren of sober and Reformed Churches, and with many whose tenets we abjure; with the disciples of Brigham Young; with the priestess of Christian Science; with Spiritism; with the new Elijah of Chicago, and if there be any other distraught and extravagant and evanescent fanaticism ram-

pant in our country — ” May we remind the excellent Bishop who wrote these words that those two hundred sects, all of them, also appear as Christian? By parity of reasoning, then, if we are to abandon the word “ Protestant ” we should also abandon the word “ Christian.”

It is also said that “ we show our partisanship by ignoring the fact that there are other schools of thought in the Church which are entitled to rights equally with our own.” But can it be claimed that it is *the right* of any school in the Church to demand that the name of the Church, under which the three great historic schools of thought have hitherto been willing to stand, should be blotted out? It is their right to *advocate* such a change, and it is equally our right to oppose it, but on what principle can it be maintained that this exercise of our right of opposition is a denial of their right of advocacy?

2. Our objection to the change proposed is not a note of partisanship.

We acknowledge freely that this proposal fills us with anxiety for the future of our Church, but we ask the candid reader if we

are not justified in this apprehension. In one form or another this proposition has been brought forward and renewed for more than thirty years, and it has always proceeded from the extreme party of the Church, the party which speaks evil of the Reformers, which belittles the Reformation, and which has been engaged for half a century in the propaganda of doctrines and practices which are subversive of the principles of the Reformation as those principles are enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer. The fact that several Broad Churchmen united in this Proposal at Cincinnati does not change the essential fact that the source of the movement was in the extreme party.

Let us be frank with one another. We entirely respect the earnestness and zeal of our opponents; but it is impossible not to recognize that their principles and ours are fundamentally opposed. I think they will acknowledge — indeed their leaders have acknowledged, over and over again — that they desire to restore the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Reservation of the Elements, Eucharistic Adoration, the Objective Presence in the Elements, the Sacrament of Penance, the doc-

trine of the Seven Sacraments, and the Invocation of Saints.¹

We do not claim that all who favor this change hold these views; but the most active, the most energetic, the most influential among the advocates of the change are men who do hold them. And therefore the proposal to drop the word "Protestant" from the name of the Church necessarily has a doctrinal significance. It must be considered in the light of the agitation which has been going on for more than a generation, whose supreme end has been to undo the work of the Reformation, as that work has been understood by the great leaders of the Church for three hundred years.

In saying this we do not lay ourselves open to the charge of misrepresentation. It would be easy to quote many utterances of the leaders of the New "Catholic" party which more than justify what we have just said. Not only so, but *our understanding of the situation is supported by the words of many*

¹ It is one of the humors of Controversy to find the leaders of the Reactionary party in the Church claiming to be progressives — twentieth century thinkers — when their supreme aim is so evidently the bringing back of the doctrines and the ceremonial of the middle ages.

of the most influential of the English Bishops, spoken from time to time during the last half century.

Among the prelates who since 1868 have lifted up their voices in warning against the novel and strange doctrines and practices introduced into the Anglican Church, I may mention the following: Dr. Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford (1869); Dr. Longley, Archbishop of Canterbury (1868); the Archbishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York (1875); Dr. John Jackson, Bishop of London (1875); Dr. Christopher Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln (1871); Dr. William Magee, Bishop of Peterborough (1878); Dr. Charles J. Ellicott, Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (1871); a pastoral from all the Bishops (1901).

These names are among the most illustrious in the history of the English Church, and their utterances taken together constitute as full and fair a representation of the opinions of the Anglican Episcopate as could be made. It would be impossible in my limits to quote from them all. Enough to say that with one voice they warn us against "the dangers that now menace the Established National Church."

Archbishop Longley, in a charge prepared in 1868, states that some of the ministers of our Church “ think themselves at liberty to hold the doctrines of the Church of Rome in relation to the Sacrifice of the Mass, and yet retain their position within the pale of the Anglican Church, with the avowed purpose of eliminating from its formularies every trace of the Reformation, as regards its protest against Romish error. . . . They call it a ‘ Communion deeply tainted with Protestant heresy.’ ‘ Our duty,’ they say, ‘ is the expulsion of the evils.’ . . . It is no want of charity, therefore, to declare that they aim to substitute the Mass for the Communion; the obvious aim of our Reformers having been to substitute the Communion for the Mass.”

Another of these prelates, the famous and learned Bishop Jackson, in a charge delivered in 1875, said: “ The peculiarity of our day is the development of a party within the Church, not numerous, but zealous, active, and bold, who, having assented solemnly to the Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, and asserted their belief that the doctrine of the Church of England, as therein set forth, is agreeable to the Word of God, avow

it their wish and purpose to undo the work of the Reformation, attack or explain away the anti-Roman positions of the Articles, of which they confess their dislike, and deprecate the Prayer Book in comparison with Roman or Pre-Reformation service books, from which they supplement, not their private only, but their public devotions. In their teachings almost every doctrine and practice is reproduced which at the Reformation was renounced and laid aside. . . . Seven Sacraments are again taught; prayers for the dead, not without reference to purgatory, practiced and supplied; the invocation of the Virgin and of the Saints, recommended and introduced both in hymns and manuals of devotion; a doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist maintained which but verbally, if verbally, differs from Transubstantiation; and Auricular Confession explained in accordance with the definitions of Trent, and enforced as essential to peace and pardon for all who would live holily and die happily. No wonder that Roman Catholic divines have asserted, what some leaders of this so-called Catholic Movement have indeed themselves admitted, that they are doing in the Church

of England the work of the Church of Rome.” The Pastoral from the Archbishops and Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York (1875) thus speaks: “ We also observe with increasing anxiety and alarm the dissemination of doctrines and encouragement of practices repugnant to the teaching of Holy Scripture, and to the principles of the Church as derived from apostolic times and as authoritatively set forth at the Reformation.”

These passages may suffice to convey an idea of the attitude of the distinguished Bishops whose names I have given above. Their opinions find a clear echo among the leading Bishops in England at the present time.

A quarter of a century before the former, however, in 1844–45, a great American Bishop — great for his learning, for his character, for his influence — I mean Dr. John Henry Hopkins, Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont, addressed to the Church four letters, entitled “ The Novelties which Disturb our Peace,” in which he sounded the trumpet of alarm against the introduction of the novel and strange principles introduced by the Oxford

Tract writers — principles and practices similar to those against which the English Bishops quoted above uttered their warning; similar also to those which are put forward at the present time in our own Church. Bishop Hopkins alludes to the frequent efforts of our Oxford brethren to disparage the character and work of the Reformers and the impossibility of harmonizing their modern doctrines with the old standards of English theology.

Now, whether these able and distinguished men were right or wrong in their diagnosis of the state of the Church, I do not stop to consider; my sole object in quoting them is to show that the anxiety which we feel has been felt and expressed by a long line of the leaders of the Church during the last half-century — men who were not partisans (very few of whom indeed could be described as Low Churchmen), but truly representative men, many of them strong High Churchmen. Meanwhile, during these fifty years this “revolutionary party,” as Bishop Jackson called it, has been steadily growing in strength and influence, until, under the leadership of Lord Halifax, President of the

English Church Union, it has assumed a defiant and intolerant tone.

Under these conditions we ask our friends of the other side to say frankly whether we are not justified in our belief that the change of the name of the Church which they so earnestly urge upon us does necessarily have a doctrinal significance; and whether it would not certainly, and justly, be regarded as a triumph of the anti-Protestant party in the Church today?

We ask also every candid man among the Neo-Catholic leaders whether our opposition to a doctrinal programme which they must acknowledge was never proclaimed in the English Church before the time of John Henry Newman, can justly be called partisanship? Loyalty to the doctrines handed down to us by eleven generations of Anglican Churchmen compels us to oppose a party which both Dr. Jackson, Bishop of London, and our own Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, tell us was never known in the English Church till the time of the Oxford Upheaval.

VI

THE PROGRAMME OF THE NEO-CATHOLIC PARTY

IF I may do so without offense, I would like to ask the leaders of the Neo-Catholic party amongst us to say whether it is not their purpose to eliminate from our standards not only the name, but the thing for which the word “Protestant” stands — the doctrines which are connoted by the word, and which the word was understood to imply at the time of the Reformation? And if so, are we who believe profoundly in the principles of the Reformation to be blamed if our apprehensions are not allayed by the assurance given by some of the leaders at Cincinnati, that in proposing to change the name of the Church they did not intend any change in the “principles established by or through the Reformation of the Church of England as those principles are enshrined in the Book of Common Prayer”? (At the very time that assurance was given us, the “Catholic”

party was celebrating a “ Requiem Mass ” in one of the Cincinnati churches in memory of Wm. R. Huntington, their life-long opponent.)

Lord Halifax, the most influential leader in the Neo-Catholic party, has recently declared at the Barrow Church Congress “ that the principles of the Reformation are things to be repented of with tears and in ashes.” And we are not so deaf as to fail to hear in many utterances on this side of the ocean the echo of these words of his, nor are we so blind as not to see the active propaganda which is going on throughout the whole Church to bring back to our Church doctrines and rites which were repudiated at the Reformation. Lord Halifax did, indeed, in the address to which I have just alluded, express his thankfulness “ for the plain Catholic teaching in the Book of Common Prayer ”; but nevertheless he does not hesitate to say that some important “ Catholic ” practices and doctrines are obscured in the Prayer Book, such as the Invocation of the Saints, and Prayers for the Dead. The fact that these practices find no place in the Prayer Book is not in his estimation a final

answer. He asks: "*Are Catholic beliefs and Catholic practices to be determined by and conformed to that which is explicitly ordered by the Prayer Book; or, are the arrangements contemplated by the Prayer Book to be interpreted by the requirements of Catholic practice and doctrines?*" That is the real point at issue. The same remark applies to the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick and dying. Are we to be tied to an interpretation of a rubric, doubtful in itself, . . . or is *our practice to be harmonized with and made comfortable to Catholic beliefs and Catholic practices, and the needs of souls?*"

Now, here we have the cardinal principle of the Neo-Catholic party clearly and boldly avowed, and that principle is that the Prayer Book is not the authoritative standard of Catholic practice.

Rather must the individual priest interpret the Prayer Book "by the requirements of Catholic practice and doctrines." Thus the rubrics and doctrinal statements of the Prayer Book are made secondary to what is called Catholic tradition; just as the Church of Rome makes tradition the interpreter and

judge of Holy Scripture, so making Tradition, and not the Word of God, the authoritative standard in the Church. The principles thus enunciated by Lord Halifax find an echo in a recent utterance of the editor of the *Living Church* (Oct. 14, 1911). In answering the question, "What are the standards of authority in this American Church?" he includes as one of them "the world-wide tradition of the Church Catholic," and among the practices based on this world-wide tradition he includes the "right of confession before a priest, followed by absolution," and "fasting Communion," and "the right of sick people to receive the Reserved Sacrament and Unction."

THE INTOLERANCE OF THE "CATHOLIC" PARTY

The editor of the *Living Church* courteously says: "We deprecate division in the Church on any lines that may divide West Virginia from the Living Church. We, for our part, cordially welcome the Catholic constructiveness of Virginia Churchmen."

This tolerant spirit, we regret to say, is by no means shared by all the leaders of the "Catholic" party. It would be easy to quote utterances in a contrary sense from another Church paper flying the flag of that party. Now and then articles appear in the Church press expressing the conviction that it is impossible for the principles of the Catholic and the Protestant parties to co-exist for long side by side in this Church. In this connection I call attention to a recent utterance of that distinguished layman already referred to, who is recognized as the great champion of the Catholic party in the English Church, and whose voice is more influential in that party than probably that of any other man — bishop, priest, or deacon. I refer to Lord Halifax, President of the English Church Union. In the month of June last, at the annual meeting of the E. C. U., he expressed himself as follows on the subject of the toleration of Protestants in the English Church:

"It may be well to tolerate these differences, as things are, for the sake of the conversion of those who may thus be brought to the full knowledge and acceptance of the

truth; but more than this is impossible, if we are to be faithful witnesses to the truth.” Continuing, he said: “ Since the sixteenth century Protestantism has effected a *de facto* lodgment within the borders of the Church, an anomaly in itself hardly tolerable.” And yet again, he said: “ Is it possible, I would ask, to tolerate a condition of things so contradictory of the nature and office of the Church except on two conditions:

“ 1. That nothing is done on the part of the rulers of the Church to make the recovery of the Catholic doctrine and practice more difficult; or,

2. To consolidate and legitimatize the position of those within the Church who, from a Catholic point of view, ought never to have been allowed to acquire the position they now hold.”

These, be it observed, are the careful and deliberate utterances of the most influential leader of the “ Catholic ” party (whose leadership, too, is implicitly acknowledged by that party in America as well as in England), whereby he gives us to understand that we Protestants have no right within the pale of the Anglican Church; that we are only

tolerated in the hope of our conversion to what he calls Catholic Truth, and on condition that nothing shall be done to legitimize the position we occupy within the Church, inasmuch as we ought never to have been allowed to acquire that position. We cannot regard this as a mere *brutum fulmen*; it expresses the firm and deep conviction of one who is a conspicuous influential leader among those who uphold so-called Catholic principles. Perhaps he is right, at least in the opinion that the two systems are mutually exclusive. It may well be questioned, indeed, whether these principles, and the principles held by the leaders of the English Church for three hundred years, are not so mutually contradictory, so mutually destructive, that it is in the nature of things impossible that they should continue to live side by side in the same communion. One or the other must triumph.

But, leaving this question on one side, we cannot be blamed if we conclude that should the Catholic party obtain control of this Church men who profess Protestant principles, as we understand them, could no longer expect to be tolerated.

The utterance of Lord Halifax which I have quoted finds an echo in the words of an enthusiastic supporter of the Catholic revival in the *Churchman* (Oct. 21, 1911, p. 563).

The writer, the Rev. W. M. Gamble, after making the astounding assertion that the English Church "was never committed to a Protestant position," goes on to say that "Protestantism and Catholicism are irreconcilable, and that they cannot continue indefinitely to exist in the same Church"; and adds, as to the Anglican Church, "that she alone has tried . . . the hazardous experiment of tolerating Protestantism not only in her Communion, but in her ministry." It would be easy to give passages parallel in sentiment to those from the columns of the *American Catholic*.

THE PRAYER BOOK MADE OF NONE EFFECT BY DEFERENCE TO "CATHOLIC" TRADITION

In the light, then, of these utterances of representative men on both sides of the water, we cannot resist the conclusion that

the Neo-Catholic party governs itself not by the law of the Prayer Book, but by "the higher law" of Catholic tradition. Of this there could not be a better illustration than the assertion of the right of Reservation for the Sick—in the face of the rubric, in the face of the Article, in the face of the Counsel of our House of Bishops in 1895, and in the face of the decision of the two archbishops in England in 1901, after a long and exhaustive argument on both sides, and after a painstaking consideration of the whole question by their Graces; in the face also of the fact that the whole body of the English Bishops united in a pastoral exhorting the clergy to conform to the decision of the archbishops, which decision declared that "Reservation in any form was contrary to the law of the Church of England." In the face of all this, Reservation of the Elements is asserted as a "part of the legitimate pastoral office of a parish priest."

The editor of the *Living Church* (June 11, 1910, p. 200) asserted that "no intelligent person alleges now that the rubric at the end of the Communion Office has any reference to the Reservation for the sick."

Subsequently, indeed, he admitted that that statement was an exaggeration.

Compare now with this opinion the following from one of the greatest bishops of the Anglican Communion in modern times, a very able and learned man, and withal a strong High Churchman,— I mean Dr. Mandell Creighton, Bishop of London. Referring to the permission given in the Prayer Book in 1549, he says: “ This restricted form of reservation was struck out in 1552, and has never been restored. Moreover, a rubric was added, ‘ It shall never be carried out of the church.’ I know there are attempts to explain that away, but we must not try to explain away plain words that have to be read in the light of the previous concession ” (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 311).

Again the Bishop says: “ I am certain it was meant to be prohibited by the present rubrics.” And again: It is clear that the Prayer Book contemplates the good of the sick person and provides that he shall have the satisfaction of a complete service, including consecration in his presence. Reservation in any form upsets this (*Ibid.*, p. 310).

Once more, he says: “The Archbishop’s opinion is strongly against any recognition of Reservation, on the ground, which I strongly feel, that the separation of the recipient from the act of consecration is opposed to the spirit of the Prayer Book.” And again: “No Bishop could say publicly that he believed Reservation for the sick to be absolutely free from the danger of any ulterior results. This being so, how can he claim to possess any power of dispensing from the mode prescribed by the Prayer Book?” (*Life*, vol. ii. p. 313.)

Compare the opinion of our House of Bishops in 1895 in their pastoral letter:

“The practice of reserving the sacrament is not sanctioned by the law of this Church, though the Ordinary may in cases of extreme necessity authorize the Reservation of the Sacrament to be carried to the sick. We are deeply pained to know that any among us adopt a use of the Reserved Elements such as the Article condemns as ‘not ordained by Christ’ . . . No ingenuity of evasion can turn the plain ‘shall not be carried out of the Church,’ ‘shall reverently eat and drink

the same,’ into an authorization of the use of the remaining elements for a service of benediction or for purposes of adoration. Most earnestly do we appeal to the clergy to consider the wrong of such disobedience alike to the letter and the spirit of our ecclesiastical law.”

In sharp contrast with this utterance of the whole House of Bishops were the words of the Bishop of Fond du Lac in 1910, speaking *ex cathedra* before his Diocesan Council. He commended the practice of Reservation for the sick without any qualification, and said: “I hereby authoritatively authorize the use of it.”

Nor can it be denied that under the cover of this guarded sanction in cases of extreme necessity a wide-spread practice of Reservation has grown up without any Episcopal sanction. In many places we see the Sacrament openly reserved in the church and its presence indicated by a sanctuary light. The people are taught that it is used “as a center of prayer to secure our Lord’s perpetual presence”; services of “Adoration” and “Exposition” and “Benediction” are held, and a *cultus* of the Blessed Sacrament estab-

lished such as this Church certainly has never known before.

These facts and quotations exhibit us before the world in a most painful light, as a house fatally divided against itself. The special correspondent of the *Church Times* called attention, in one of his letters from America, to this subject in the following language: "I am afraid that the traditions of English Catholicism are in revolt against some of the phases of Perpetual Reservation as I have seen it practiced" (*Living Church*, April 22, p. 838).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I call attention to the manner in which the issue is described by our critics. We are told that it is an "issue between Catholic Comprehension and Protestant Partisanship." In reply we beg to ask whether principles which embrace the three historic schools of thought of the English Church for four hundred years can be described as partisanship? We ask, again, whether the word "Protestant," which has been accepted as descriptive of their position

not only by Low Churchmen, but by the highest Churchmen in the Church of England and our own, down to the period of the Oxford upheaval, is not more truly described as an inclusive word, a comprehensive word? And then we ask whether the position of the Neo-Catholic party, which denies the ultimate authority of the Prayer Book and substitutes for it an appeal to Catholic tradition, can be correctly described as Catholic comprehension? Is it not rather individual eclecticism? In insisting upon the principle that the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should be treated with no greater deference than any other centuries in the history of the Church, this party places itself in direct antagonism to the position held by an overwhelming majority of the great divines of the Anglican Church, for nearly four hundred years past, and reveals itself not as the party of Comprehension, but as the party of Sectarian Division.

The representatives of the "Catholic" party tell us that they stand for comprehensiveness and we for a narrow partisanship. This, at any rate, is the way it presents itself to our minds. The other view we have hon-

estly endeavored to grasp, but without success. For what is the test and proof of a true "Catholic" in the sense in which our friends use the term? Is it not adherence to the six points of ritual? Doctrinally, is it not the acceptance of the Sacrifice of the Mass, of the Objective Presence in the Elements, of Eucharistic Adoration, of the Invocation of the Saints, of the Sacrament of Penance, of Reservation of the Elements, of Seven Sacraments? And if so, how, we have asked ourselves, can the "Catholic" party stand for comprehensiveness? It is certain that their doctrinal position does not comprehend the leading divines of the sixteenth century, or the seventeenth, or the eighteenth century, or the first half of the nineteenth century. According to their definition of the word it would be hard to find a true Catholic in the Church of England for three hundred years. Illustrious divines like Cranmer and Jewel and Richard Hooker and Andrewes and Jeremy Taylor and Cosin and Hall and Bramhall and Archbishop Laud would not be eligible for membership in the Catholic party today. Neither would Bishop Lightfoot or Bishop Ellicott or Bishop Wilberforce or

Bishop Thirlwall or Bishop Westcott or Bishop Creighton or Archbishop Benson or Archbishop Temple or the present Archbishop of Canterbury. Very few indeed of our own House of Bishops today are Catholic by this test, and really we can recall scarcely half a dozen in the American Succession in the nineteenth century who could qualify for membership. Having all this in view, we should have said that the Catholic party was marked by exclusiveness rather than by comprehensiveness, since it excludes nearly all the illustrious divines of the Church of England and America for three hundred years. It only shows, I suppose, the difference of the point of view.

On the other hand, we would have said that the Protestant part of the Church was the representative of comprehensiveness, since it comprehends most of the men of the three historical schools of thought from the time of King Edward Sixth's reign down to the reign of King George V, in the year of grace 1912, including the most representative of our American Bishops, such as Bishop White, Bishop John Williams, of Connecticut, Bishop

Whittingham, of Maryland, and Bishop Brooks, of Massachusetts.

And, what is of great moment to the Protestant party, the principles of Protestantism include the doctors and fathers of the first three centuries as well as the Apostles and other writers of the New Testament, as well also as the many millions of orthodox believers in other Communions than our own who profess and call themselves Protestants.

VII

THE THEOLOGY OF THE ANGLO-CATHOLIC DIVINES

Two Letters showing that the writings of the most illustrious of the Anglo-Catholic Divines are opposed to Sacramental Confession; the Sacrifice of the Mass; the Objective Presence in the Elements; Reservation, Eucharistic Adoration, and the Doctrine of Seven Sacraments.¹

FOREWORD

The Letters, herewith republished, suffice to show the position of the Divines whose writings are quoted therein, on the chief doctrines and practices characteristic of the new school of theology in the Anglican Communion. It would be easy to show more at length that those great Divines of the seventeenth century, beginning with Andrewes and ending with Bull, had not the least sympathy with the mediævalism with which the primitive faith and worship had been corrupted. Bishop Andrewes, in his answer to Bellarmine, strongly condemns the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist, the Seven Sacraments, Communion in one kind, Reservation, Non-communicating Attendance, Purgatory, Saint Worship, Angel Worship. He also condemns Incense and Lights in his Discourse on Ceremonies. Archbishop Laud likewise condemns the Roman doctrine of the Eucharist, Transubstantiation, Communion in one kind,

¹ From the *Living Church* of Feb. 18 and 25, 1911.

THE CHANGE OF NAME 141

Invocation of Saints, and Purgatory. Bishop Cosin condemned Transubstantiation, the Mass, Elevation, Adoration of the Host, Communion in one kind, the Objective Presence, Reservation, the Seven Sacraments, Purgatory and Saint Worship. The same can be said of Jeremy Taylor, Bull, Bramhall, Beveridge, and others. And we may say in general that the Caroline Divine stood firmly on the platform of the Reformation.

The letters which follow were written in redemption of the following pledge which appeared over my signature in the *Living Church* of Jan. 7, 1911:

"Neither Eucharistic Adoration, nor Sacramental Confession, nor the Objective Presence, nor the Sacrifice of the Mass, nor Reservation, nor Seven Sacraments, can claim the support of Bishop Beveridge or Bishop Overall or Bishop Andrewes or Bishop Cosin or Bishop Jeremy Taylor or Bishop Bull or Bishop Bramhall or Bishop Hall (of course I do not include the pseudo-Cosin writings). I hold myself ready to establish this proposition by quotations from their writings, if necessary."

R. H. McK.

FIRST LETTER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LIVING CHURCH:

IN my letter published in your issue of December 17th last, I stated that the Anglo-Catholic divines acknowledged themselves Protestants, whereupon one of your correspondents in your issue of December 24th, page 268, sought to weaken the force of that fact by the assertion that those divines "understood the word 'Protestant' to include such things as the Real Presence, the

Sacrifice of the Mass, Eucharistic Adoration, Sacramental Confession, and the Use of Incense." It was in rebuttal of this statement that I said in my letter of December 29th, "that neither Eucharistic Adoration, nor Sacramental Confession, nor the Objective Presence, nor Seven Sacraments, could claim the support of those divines." Thus the challenge which gave rise to this controversy really came from the Rev. E. D. Weed and not from me. This affirmation of mine is now called in question by several esteemed writers in your issue of February 4th. Let me, then, justify, as I think I can, my statement, taking first the teaching of Jeremy Taylor.

SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION

Father Hughson stumbles at the term "Sacramental Confession." But why? It is a familiar technical term signifying Confession considered as a Sacrament, or the Sacrament of Penance. This is what I affirm has no support, so far as I have been able to find, in the writings of Jeremy Taylor.

Now, Father Hughson believes in the Sacrament of Penance, and, strange to say, he

admits in advance that Bishop Jeremy Taylor is against him in that. He says: "We Catholics, though the weighty authority of Bishop Taylor be against us, do indeed believe that Penance, that is, confession of sins to a priest, followed by absolution, is a true and proper Sacrament." I might, therefore, drop the matter here and claim that my critic has confessed judgment. But let us look into it more closely. I think it may be fairly said, in the words of a learned Anglican divine, that the clergy to whom I refer hold "that our Prayer Book recognizes a power given to its priests of privately and personally forgiving sins by a form of words, and that that is the ordinary and most sure means of pardon which no man can safely or wisely neglect; and that private confession is so closely connected with it as a necessary condition that it partakes of its character as a necessary means of pardon." "They tell young boys and girls that the safest preparation for the Holy Communion is the disclosure to a priest of every sin they have ever committed . . . as an essential part and condition of a solemn sacramental conveyance of actual pardon through words

spoken by the priest standing in the person of God, and forgiving sins with the same power God Himself would exercise if He were again to descend upon earth." Father Hughson may recall the words of the Abbé Gaume, whose *Manuel des Confesseurs* Dr. Pusey adapted for the use of his followers: "The Priest, mighty as God, can in one moment snatch the sinner from hell. . . . God Himself is bound to adhere to the judgment of the Priest."

This is the way Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Winchester understood the matter. He says: "The tendency of the doctrine now put forward on this subject is to exalt the use of confession into a necessity of Christian life. . . . It is now sought to establish that habitual confession is almost necessary for the leading of the highest Christian life. This leads on rapidly to the old habit of believing that private confession of sins to the Great High Priest is insufficient, and without confession to a priest a man cannot be sure of pardon, and especially cannot draw near to God in the Holy Sacrament. Now, of this, I will say that this system of confession is one of the worst developments of Popery."

Now, my esteemed critics have brought forward a number of passages from Jeremy Taylor on the subject of private confession, not one of which establishes the agreement of that great divine with the doctrine of Sacramental Confession. May I respectfully suggest that they have mistaken the issue? I have not denied, I could not deny, that the Anglo-Catholic divines recognized the use and value of private confession in certain cases.

It may be well to dwell for a moment upon the change that took place at the Reformation in the Church of England on this subject. Dr. Moberly says: "The Reformers wished deliberately to substitute one ideal for another. Auricular Confession had been a part of the normal ideal of a pious Christian life. That was what they wished to alter" (*Report of the Conference at Fulham Palace*, 1902, p. 64). They did not declare it unlawful or unprofitable, but they ordained that it must not be exalted into a sacrament, or held generally necessary or binding upon all men. It must no longer be compulsory, but voluntary; no longer the rule, but the exception; no longer habitual,

but occasional. Penance must no longer be counted a sacrament of the Gospel. Public confession and absolution was henceforth to be regarded as the chief and normal way by which to find comfort and peace, but provision was made for exceptional cases, and the opening of grief to the pastor. But Lord Halifax, who may be taken as a fair representative, as he is the most distinguished leader of the "Catholic" party in England, said at the Fulham conference, "Confession should be *the rule* in the Christian life" (*Report of the Conference at Fulham Palace*, 1902, p. 69). Now, most of the quotations from Jeremy Taylor by your correspondents on the subject of private confession refer to those exceptional cases — cases of troubled consciences; cases of persons heavy laden with their sins; cases when one particular sin lies heavy upon the conscience. But I did not deny that Jeremy Taylor believed in the use of private confession, and I am no way concerned here with the great Bishop's teaching on that subject, except to sustain the point that he does not teach Sacramental Confession. Greatly as I admire the Anglo-Catholic divines, I make my own the familiar resolve: "*Nullius addictus jurare in verba*

magistri." I hold, therefore, that the passages quoted by my courteous critics are not relevant to the issue.

Let us approach the subject from another point of view. It will be admitted, I think, that sacerdotal judicial absolution is included in Sacramental Confession, as held and practiced by the "Catholic" clergy. The principal of Pusey House speaks of "the gift of a Divine Tribunal which judges of the applicability of the forgiveness" (*Report of Fulham Conference*, 1902, p. 19).

But Jeremy Taylor distinctly repudiates this. In proof I cite the following passages from his treatise on Auricular Confession:

1. "That confession to a priest is a doctrine taught as necessary in the Church of Rome, is without all question; and yet that it is but the commandment of men, I shall, I hope, clearly enough evince" (Section xi. p. 9).

2. "The priest's power is declarative, not judicial; the sentence of an ambassador, not of a judge" (*Ibid.*, p. 24).

3. "St. Ambrose affirms the priest's power of pardoning sins to be wholly ministerial and optative, or by way of prayer . . .

There is no proper judicial power ” (*Report of Fulham Conference*, 1902, p. 25).

4. “ Therefore we find in the old penitentials and usages of the Church that the priest did not absolve the penitent in the indicative, or judicial form ” (*Ibid.*, p. 26).

5. “ No man had ever dreamt of a judicial power of absolution ” (*Ibid.*).

6. “ There is no necessity declared in Scripture of confessing all our sins to a priest, *no mention of Sacramental penance or confession* ” (*Ibid.*, p. 30).

7. “ St. Paul commands every one that is to receive the Holy Communion ‘ to examine himself, and so let him eat ’; he forgot, it seems, to enjoin them to go to confession to be examined! ” (*Ibid.*, p. 31.)

8. “ Certainly men lived better lives when, by the discipline of the Church, they were brought to public stations and penance, than now they do, by all the advantages, real and pretended, from auricular confession.”

9. He quotes St. Chrysostom: “ Declare unto God alone thy sin, saying, Against Thee only have I sinned . . . and thy sin is forgiven thee ”; adding, “ It is plain that he not only speaks against the public judicial

penance and confession; but against all, except that alone which is made to God " (*Report of Fulham Conference*, 1902, p. 45).

10. He inveighs with indignation against the practice " that all men and all women should come and make the priest's ears a common sewer to empty all their filthiness "; and continues: " All this filthy communication is therefore intolerable, . . . it not only pollutes the priest's ears, but his tongue, too " (*Ibid.*, p. 33). [We can imagine his indignation against that famous book, *The Priest in Absolution*, of which the Archbishop of Canterbury said in 1877: " It is a disgrace to the community that such a book should be circulated under the authority of clergymen of the established Church "; which, however, was circulated with the approval of the Society of the Holy Cross.]

May I, then, again suggest, with great respect to my esteemed critics, that they have quite mistaken the point at issue? The one thing I have contended for is the Protestant position of the Anglo-Catholic divines, and the question immediately before us is whether the teaching of Jeremy Taylor on

the subject of confession is inconsistent with the Protestant position. My critics bring forward a number of passages in which he and others commend the practice of confession to a priest. Now, I am not concerned to consider how far the teaching of these divines on the subject of confession is in accordance with the Holy Scriptures and the teaching of the formularies of the Anglican Church. My one contention is that they do not support the practice and doctrine of *Sacramental confession*; in other words, the Sacrament of Penance as administered, for example, by such leaders of the "Catholic" school as were Dr. Pusey and Canon T. T. Carter.

I suppose it will not be denied that Luther was a Protestant, and yet Luther, in his shorter catechism, has much to say about private confession and absolution. I may point out that the Prayer Book put forth in 1883 by the General Lutheran Conference contains the following: "It is easy to recognize that the Roman method of Auricular confession cannot but become an insupportable oppression and a torturer of consciences, while the Lutheran method of private con-

fession contains an inexpressible comfort and blessing."

I suppose also my critics will not deny that I am a Protestant, and yet on Sunday last, I gave to my parishioners the same admonishment and exhortation which Mr. Larned quotes as an example of Sacramental confession from Bishop Overall, namely, "If they have their conscience troubled and disquieted, to resort unto me or some other learned minister, that they may receive such ghostly counsel and comfort, as their consciences may be relieved."

The same writer reminds us that Bishop Bull confessed and received absolution more than once during his last illness. Let me remind him that Richard Hooker, upon occasion, also used private confession, and yet this was Hooker's doctrine: "We labor to instruct men in such sort that every soul which is wounded with sin may learn the way to cure itself; they, clean contrary, would make all sores seem incurable, unless the priest have a hand in them."

I may here mention that Bishop Bull speaks of the Sacrament of Penance, as taught in the Church of Rome, as a danger-

ous and damnable doctrine. That Church teaches that “ it is absolutely necessary for a sinner to make an auricular confession to, and be absolved by, a priest, though God hath nowhere said so ” (*Sermon 1*).

For my part, I find it difficult to believe that Father Hughson could read Taylor’s *Auricular Confession* through, and still think that he held to Sacramental Confession. And if he did, one could only consider him an illustration of the saying, “ *Stat pro ratione voluntas.* ”

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, THE OBJECTIVE PRESENCE, AND EUCHARISTIC ADORATION

In examining the teaching of Jeremy Taylor on the subject of the Real Presence, we must take care to observe that “ the Real Presence ” is by no means an equivalent expression to “ the Objective Presence in the Elements.” The latter is Dr. Pusey’s chosen phrase. See his sermon at Oxford, Fifth Sunday after Easter, 1841.

It is also important to bear in mind the caution given by Bishop Taylor himself in the following passage: “ We think it our

duty to give our own people caution and admonition that they be not abused by the rhetorical and high expressions alleged out of the Fathers. Now, it is very easy to quote from the Fathers, and especially from St. Chrysostom, rhetorical expressions which seem to represent him as an advocate of a real, substantial sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist; but, on the other hand, there are passages in his work in which he corrects himself, and plainly tells us what his real sentiments are. A single disclaimer of a meaning which might be attributed to his language; a single explanation on his part of what might otherwise be doubtful; a single correction of a phrase which might otherwise mislead, surely serves as a general interpretation of an author's meaning in other passages where the like correction or explanation does not occur." In interpreting Jeremy Taylor, the English Chrysostom, this caution is equally pertinent. Let us hear him then in explanation of his views.

In his treatise on the Real Presence, he maintains that St. Augustine was a Protestant in his teaching concerning the Holy Communion, and adds, "That if all he says

on this question shall be reconcilable to transubstantiation, I know no reason but it may be possible for a witty man to pretend, when I am dead, that in this discourse I have pleaded for the doctrine of the Roman Church."

What the good Bishop thought impossible has come to pass. Several times "a witty man" has arisen, claiming the Bishop's authority for Eucharistic Adoration, for a real Propitiatory Sacrifice in the Mass, and for a doctrine of the Real Presence hardly to be distinguished from that of the Roman Church!

Hear, then, his own words. In his fifth letter to a gentleman tempted to the Communion of the Roman Church, he says:

"We may not render divine worship to Him as present in the Blessed Sacrament, according to His human nature, without danger of idolatry, because He is not there, according to His human nature. . . . He is present there by His divine power and His divine blessing. . . . But for any other presence it is *idolum*: it is nothing in the world. Adore Christ in heaven" (*Works*, Edit. Edm., vol. vi. p. 669).

Again: “ Those trifling pretenses made out of some sayings of the Fathers pretending the practice of worshiping the Sacrament, must needs be sophistry and illusion ” (*Real Presence*, xiii. 4).

As to those words, “ This is My body,” he says, he has proved them to be “ sacramental and figurative ” (*Ibid.*, § xiii). Discoursing on the spiritual presence, he says: “ By spiritual we mean present to our spirits only, that is, so as Christ is not present to any other senses but that of faith or spiritual susception. . . . We, by the real spiritual presence of Christ, do understand Christ to be present as the Spirit of God is present in the hearts of the faithful, by blessing and grace. And this is all which we mean besides the typical and figurative presence ” (*Ibid.*, § i).

In his *Ductor Dubitantium* he enumerates a great many of the “ pretended traditions of the Church of Rome,” and among them he includes “ the canon of the Mass, the doctrine of proper sacrifice in the Mass ” (*Ductor Dubitantium*, ii. 24). Again, in his *Dispersive against Popery* he mentions among the errors of the Church of Rome, “ the

affirming that the Mass is a proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead; private Mass; or the Lord's Supper without Communion" (*Dissuasive against Popery*, I. i. 11, p. 184).

As to Eucharistic Adoration: "They commit an act of idolatry in giving divine honor to a mere creature, which is the image, the sacrament, and representment of the body of Christ. . . . The commandment to worship God alone is so express; the distance between God, and bread dedicated to the service of God, is so vast; the danger of worshiping that which is not God . . . is so formidable, that it is infinitely to be presumed that if it had been intended that we should have worshiped the Holy Sacrament, the Holy Scripture would have called it God or Jesus Christ, and have bidden us in express terms to have adored it" (*Real Presence*, vii. 7, p. 493).

Concerning the action of Adoration, he says, "That it is a fit address with our hearts lifted up to heaven where Christ sits at the right hand of God"; and quotes St. Augustine's "No man eats Christ's Body worthily but he that first adores Christ."

Then he continues: “ But to terminate the divine worship of the Sacrament, to that which we eat, is unreasonable, and unnatural, and scandalous. . . . We give no divine honor to the signs; we do not call the Sacrament our God. This is a thing of infinite danger; God is a jealous God. . . . If you can believe the bread, when it is blessed by the Priest, is God Almighty, you can, if you please, believe anything else ” (*Real Presence*, § 13). Again, he says of the Body of Christ: “ This body, being carried from us into heaven, cannot be touched or tasted by us on earth; but yet Christ left to us symbols and sacraments of this natural body; *not to be or to convey that natural body to us, but to do more and better for us, to convey all the blessings and graces procured for us by the breaking of that body and the effusion of that blood* ” (*The Worthy Communicant*, i. 3, p. 422). Again, he says: “ Christ’s Body given in the Sacrament is the application and memory of His death, and no more ” (*Real Presence*, vii. 7).

As to Invocation of Saints, he says: “ Of the like danger is Invocation of Saints ” (*Dissuasive against Popery*, I. i. 11). And

again, “ Not putting our trust in saints, and speaking to dead persons who are not present.”

Let me say in closing, that I find my conclusion as to the true doctrine of the Anglo-Catholic divines confirmed, first, by the Rev. John Hunt, in his classical work, *The History of Religious Thought in the Church of England*; and secondly, by the *Church Times*, the organ of the “ Catholic ” party in England. The former says: “ Any doctrine of the Real Presence that was in any way kindred to transubstantiation was unknown among Laud’s Churchmen ” (vol. i. p. 348). Again, “ Taylor says we may say that Christ’s Body is present, meaning that a corporal sign of that body is present. He rejects John vi. as having any reference to the Lord’s Supper, agreeing with Eusebius that the flesh and blood in that chapter refers to the words Christ spoke, and not to any eating of His Body in the Eucharist.” And the *Church Times* of Jan. 25, 1868, says: “ Mr. Garbett declares that he has lately been going through a course of the great Caroline theologians, Cosin, Bramhall, Thorndyke, Andrewes, Laud, Hammond, and Beveridge, and

Bishop Wilson of Sodor and Man. These writers he states himself to have found ‘cautious and moderate, he might almost say, Protestant and Evangelical, in contrast with modern Mediævalists; the difference was broad and radical.’ This has a good deal of truth in it also. . . . The plain fact is that the modern Tractarian school accepts all that is positive in the writings of the Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century, and rejects the negative part.” And the writer continues: “They obscured the faith with pedantry and overwhelmed it with logomachy.”

I must reserve for a future occasion the treatment of the other authors to whose doctrine I have referred.

RANDOLPH H. MCKIM.

Feb. 8, 1911.

SECOND LETTER

TO THE EDITOR OF THE LIVING CHURCH:

I see that your correspondents continue to supply you with a stream of quotations on the subject of Confession — all of them irrelevant; for my contention referred to “*Sacramental Confession*,” that is, confession

—

followed by judicial sacerdotal absolution; in other words, the Sacrament of Penance; and not one of your correspondents' quotations has reference to that!

"Sacramental Confession" was the term used by the critic, who affirmed that the Protestantism of the Caroline divines included that and other distinctive tenets of the "Catholic" party. "Sacramental Confession" is what I affirmed finds no support in the works of the divines I mentioned. "Sacramental Confession" is what Dr. Pusey taught and practiced, in the same sense and the same way as the Roman Church holds, proof of which is found in the use of the Roman manuals of Confession by him and his school, for example, the Abbé Gaume's *Manuel des Confesseurs*. If my critics would overthrow my contention, they must address themselves to the point at issue, and not labor to establish a proposition which I have not denied.

Let me thank Rev. Oliver Dow Smith for supplying the proof that Bishop Cosin did not hold to "Sacramental Confession," by quoting a passage in which the Bishop says: "The Church of England . . . holdeth not

'Confession and absolution sacramental.'" That is one of the salient differences between the Church of England and the leaders of the "Catholic" party — such men as Dr. Pusey and Rev. Mr. Mackonochie and Lord Halifax: these do hold confession and absolution sacramental.

THE OBJECTIVE PRESENCE

I come now to my Second Contention, which is that the doctrine of Dr. Pusey and his party of the *Objective Presence* in the elements in the Eucharist is not supported by the divines I mentioned. Closely connected with this is the practice of *Eucharistic Adoration*. Some of us remember the words of Dr. DeKoven at the Baltimore General Convention: "I adore, and teach my people to adore, Christ present in, with, and under the forms of bread and wine in the Eucharist" (I quote from memory, but I think accurately). Here are two quotations from "Catholic" authorities. The first is from a volume commended by Dr. Pusey:

Of Adoration: "We are teaching men to

believe that God is to be *worshiped* under the form of bread and wine" (*Essays on the Reunion of Christendom*, 1876, p. 180).

And in the *Little Prayer Book*, p. 16, we read: "At the words, 'This is My Body,' 'This is My Blood,' you must believe that the bread and wine BECOME the Real Body and Blood, with the soul and Godhead of Jesus Christ."

And the famous Archdeacon Denison says: "Christ's Body and Blood are really present in the Holy Eucharist, 'under the form of bread and wine.' "

Now it is easy to run to Dr. Pusey's *Catena* and pick out passages from the Caroline divines affirming a doctrine of the Real Presence; but I deny that *this* doctrine of the Real Objective Presence in the elements under the form of bread and wine can be found in those divines. The passages I shall quote (few out of many available) are decisive against such a doctrine. They supply the principle of interpretation of other passages which, if taken alone and incautiously, might be indicative of a different doctrine. Their principle of patristic interpretation gives the key to the interpretation of

their own high-flown or rhetorical utterances, namely, they are not to be taken literally, but as expressions intended to kindle devotion.

Father Hughson says he has never heard of the accuracy of Dr. Pusey's quotations being questioned. If he will read Dean William Goode's able and learned work on *The Eucharist* (London, 1856, 2 vols.), he will find Dr. Pusey's *Catena* of patristic and other authorities shown to be a very brittle chain indeed, quite unequal to support the weight he puts upon it. Many of his quotations from the Fathers in proof of his doctrine are really *opposed* to it, many are irrelevant, and many inapplicable to the point in question. Hooker's opinion, for example, is completely misrepresented.

Bishop Andrewes:

He rejected the doctrine of *seven Sacraments*. Here are his words: "For more than a thousand years the number of seven sacraments was never heard of. How then can the belief in seven sacraments be Catholic, which means, 'always believed'?" (*Responsio ad Bellarminum*, p. 72.)

On the Holy Eucharist:

“ We are willing enough to grant that there is a memory of the sacrifice in it; but we will never grant that your Christ, made of bread, is sacrificed in it ” (*Responsio ad Bellarminum*, p. 250).

In his Sermon VII on the Resurrection, speaking of the sacrifice of Christ, he says: “ While yet this offering was not, the hope of it was kept alive by the prefiguration of it in theirs (that is, their types); and after it passed, the memory of it is still kept fresh in mind by the commemoration of it in ours (that is, our anti-types). ” As to the doctrine that the glorified body of Christ is present in, with, and under the elements of bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist, Bishop Andrewes utterly repudiates it. Witness the following from the same on the Resurrection: “ By the incomprehensible power of His eternal spirit, not He alone, but He, as at the very act of His offering, is made present to us, and we incorporate in His death, and invested in the benefit of it. If an host could be turned into Him, now glorified as He is, it would not serve; Christ offered is it — thither we must look. To the Serpent lifted up, thither we

must repair, even *ad cadaver* " (to the dead body).

Bishop Andrewes expresses his strong approval of our Articles of Religion. He says: "Look at our Confession contained in the Thirty-nine Articles; . . . look at our Catechism. It is short, but in spite of its shortness, there is nothing wanting in it. Look at the Apology of our Church — truly a Jewel.¹ Whoso will, may find our doctrines there."² Thus he gives his approval to the thoroughly Protestant doctrine of the Lord's Supper, stated in Article 28, and to the strong condemnation of the Sacrifices of Masses contained in Article 31. It would be easy to quote passages from him strongly condemning Saint worship, and Angel worship, and Eucharistic Adoration. He distinguished sharply between the "veneration" due to the symbols and the adoration due to Christ. He has no word to say, so far as I can find, of

¹ See translation of Jewel's *Apologia* (Oxford edition, 1848), vol. viii. pp. 293-297, 300.

² "Christ's disciples did receive this authority, not that they should hear the private confessions of the people, and listen to their whisperings, . . . but to the end they should . . . publish abroad the gospel and be to the believing a sweet savor of life unto life" (*Ibid.*, p. 289).

our Lord's presence in, with, or under the bread and wine in the Holy Eucharist, and therefore he cannot be quoted in support of that real, objective presence in the elements which Dr. Pusey and his followers maintain. In fact, Bishop Andrewes was strongly Protestant in his doctrines, though "his love of ecclesiastical or patristic language makes him often appear out of harmony with the principles of the Reformation." Dr. Pusey, in appealing to Bishop Andrewes as his master in Eucharistic Adoration, is surely gravely mistaken. "He cannot justly be appealed to as favoring a modern school of Mediævalists that aims at bringing back tenets and principles which it is plain he abhorred from his soul." "It is plain that a yawning abyss, which nothing can span, lies between him and any school of men that looks back longingly to pre-Reformation doctrines and practices, and secretly or openly prefers them to the Protestantism of the Church of England."

Bishop Andrewes also condemned the practice of *Reservation*. He says: "That carrying about of yours is against Christ's command, and Scripture nowhere favors it.

It is contrary to the purpose of the institution. A sacrifice has to be consumed, a Sacrament to be taken and eaten, not laid up and carried about. Let that be done which Christ desired when he said, ‘ Do this,’ and there will be nothing left for the Priest to expose, or the people to worship in the Pyx ” (*Responsio ad Bellarminum*, Oxford, 1856, p. 267).

Bishop Cosin:

I turn now to the teaching of Bishop Cosin. Undoubtedly he taught that there was a real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Supper. But that may be affirmed of all orthodox Protestant divines. Even the Westminster Assembly had maintained a real, though spiritual, presence of the body and blood. “ The Church has never doubted that Christ, the living, glorified God-man, is really present in the sacred mysteries; present in His whole person, irrespective of the thoughts of the worshipers, and present in a gracious manifestation beyond what is ordinarily enjoyed in prayer or other religious exercises.” But Bishop Cosin said “ that between his doctrine of the Real Presence,

and the Transubstantiation of the Church of Rome, there was a great gulf fixed.” (Could that be said of Dr. Pusey’s doctrine?) “He explained, as the Reformers had done, that when the fathers called bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, we are not to understand them according to the letter. It was the usual manner of speaking of Sacraments, to give to the sign the name of the thing signified. They frequently called the sacramental bread and wine, types, symbols, figures, and signs of the body and blood of Christ” (*Rev. John Hunt, Religious Thought in England*, vol. i. p. 301). Cosin says: “Christ in the consecrated bread ought not, cannot be kept and preserved to be carried about, because He is present only to the communicants.” Again, he says: “The Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist means His real reception into the soul of the communicant. There is no presence to any but communicants, nor to them without faith” (*History of Transubstantiation*, i. 1). Again, he says: “In our Eucharist there is a Sacrifice made by prayers, a commemoration, and a representation, which is not properly called a Sacrifice. But nothing hinders but that

the Eucharist may be accounted and called the commemorative sacrifice of the proper sacrifice of the death of Christ, which the Lord Himself hath taught us, when He said, ‘ This do, in remembrance of Me ’ ” (Notes in Nicholl’s *Book of Common Prayer*. He distinctly rejects Eucharistic Adoration. “ The adoration is then and there given to Christ Himself, neither is, nor ought to be directed to any external, sensible object, such as the Blessed Elements ” (*Ibid.*). He quotes with approval the words of St. Augustine, “ Why dost thou prepare thy stomach and thy teeth? *Believe and thou hast eaten*, for in this mystical eating, by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost, we do invisibly receive the substance of Christ’s body and blood, as much as if we should drink and eat visibly.” Again he identifies his belief with that of the Protestant Churches of the continent, saying: “ None of the Protestant Churches doubt the real, that is, true and not imaginary, presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Sacrament.” He certainly repudiates the local presence of Christ on the altar, for he says, “ Christ is locally in

heaven alone.” He says also that His presence is not local; that it is in the Sacrament “a presence and union, of Him with the soul and body — effected by eating.” Certainly he did not maintain the Tractarian doctrine of the Real Presence. The Presence he believed in, though true and real, because spiritual, was a presence, not in the elements or under them, but in the Sacrament; *a Presence only to the faithful communicant* and to him only in the act of communion (see Vogan, *True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 199). I am aware that Bishop Cosin has been frequently quoted as favorable to mediævalist doctrine, but there is high scholarly authority for the statement that any passages favoring mediæval doctrines alleged to be from the pen of Bishop Cosin are really taken from the *First Series of Notes on the Prayer Book*,¹ which are quite erroneously attributed to the Bishop. It is the pseudo-Cosin, not the real Cosin, who sustains those doctrines. Here is his opinion about the Mass: “The word

¹ This *First Series of Notes* were erroneously attributed to Bishop Cosin by Dr. Barrow in 1855 in editing the Anglo-Catholic Library. See *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism*, pp. 93–95, by Rev. F. Meyrick, M.A., Canon of Lincoln.

Mass, as it is now used by the Papists for a true and proper sacrifice of Christ offered every time to God the Father, for the living and the dead, is nowhere found among the ancients. And for this reason the very word Mass, in its new, not its ancient, signification, is rejected by the English Church, which desires to abolish that wrong opinion about the Sacrifice of the Mass " (*Notes on the Prayer Book*). He condemns the elevation of the Host. He also condemns *Adoration*. " In all which there is not a word tending to the people's adoration of that bread and that cup; this being a late device of the New Roman Catholics, after they had brought in their novelty of Transubstantiation " (*Ibid.*). He condemns *Reservation* " of the bread and wine which the priests consecrate for the Sacrament. If he be careful, as he ought to be, to consecrate no more than will suffice to be distributed unto the communicants, none will remain " (*Notes on the Office of the Holy Communion*). As to the doctrine of *Seven Sacraments*, he condemns it as a Papal invention unknown to the ancient Church (*Regni Angliae Religio*).
--

Archbishop Bramhall:

“ We deny not a venerable respect unto the consecrate elements, not only as love tokens sent us by our best friend, but as the instruments ordained by our Saviour to convey to us the merits of His passion; but for the Person of Christ, God forbid that we should deny Him divine worship at any time and especially in the use of this holy Sacrament; we believe with St. Austin, that ‘ no man eats of that flesh but first he adores ’; but that which offends us is this, that you teach and require all men to adore the very Sacrament with divine honor ” (*Works*, vol. i. p. 21).

Elsewhere the Archbishop objects to “ their injunction to all communicants to adore, not only Christ in the use of the Sacrament, to which we do readily assent, but to adore the Sacrament itself ” (*Ibid.*, ii. 36).

Again, he says: “ Neither will it avail them anything at all, that the fathers have sometimes used such expressions of ‘ seeing Christ,’ of ‘ touching Christ ’ in the Sacrament, of ‘ fastening our teeth in His Flesh ’ . . . The fathers never meant by these forms

of speech to determine the manner of the Presence (which was not dreamt of in their days), but *to raise the devotion of their hearers and readers; to advertise the people of God that they should not rest in the external symbols or signs, but principally be intent on the invisible grace* " (*Works*, i. 14).

Bishop Beveridge:

In his commentary on Article 38 he says :

" If the bread be not really changed into the Body of Christ, then *the Body of Christ is not really there present*; and if it be not really there present, it is impossible it should be really eaten and received into our bodies as bread is. . . . It being thus only after a spiritual manner that we receive the body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, there can be no other means whereby we can receive Him but by faith."

Again, commenting on 1 Cor. x. 16, he says :
" *Though it be not His very Body and Blood itself, it is the communion of them.*"

Bishop Bull:

" In the Holy Eucharist, therefore, we set before God the Bread and Wine, as figures or

images of the precious blood of Christ, shed for us, and of His precious body (they are the very words of the Clementine Liturgy), and plead to God the merit of His Son's Sacrifice once offered on the cross for sinners, and in this Sacrament represented " (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome*, vol. ii. p. 252).

Again, commenting on the words of Institution: " Whatsoever our Saviour said was undoubtedly true; but these words could not be true in a proper sense; for our Saviour's body was not then given or broken, but whole and inviolate; nor was there one drop of His blood yet shed. The words, therefore, must necessarily be understood in a figurative sense " (*Corruptions of the Church of Rome, Works*, ii. 254).

Bishop Overall:

Let it be observed that one of the sources of information concerning this divine's opinions is a polluted source; I mean his Notes appended to Nicholl's *Comment on the Book of Common Prayer*. They are not the Bishop's notes at all.

Here is a passage from one of his genuine writings:

“ In the Sacrament of the Eucharist the Body and Blood of Christ are thus whole Christ applied to those who receive *worthily*, not by way of transubstantiation, nor by the way of consubstantiation, but by the HOLY SPIRIT WORKING THROUGH FAITH ” (MS. in British Museum, 3142, quoted by Dean Goode).

In Archdeacon Denison’s defense a letter of Bishop Overall’s to Grotius was read containing a passage in approval of the worship and reservation of Christ in the Sacrament; but it turned out to be a complete mistranslation of the Latin! It should have read: “ They oppose our Church’s custom of receiving the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ kneeling, or at least they refuse to observe and keep it ” (*aut eum saltem colere et custodire recusant*). By rendering these words “ or at least object to His worship and *reservation*, ” Bishop Overall had been represented as sanctioning Eucharistic worship and reservation!

Bishop Hall:

We may safely infer this prelate’s opinions on Sacramental Confession and the Sacrifice

of the Mass and the Objective Presence in the elements by his declaration of loyalty to the Articles of Religion.

He says in *The Old Religion*: “The voice of God our Father in His Scriptures, and (out of them) the voice of the Church our mother in her articles, is that which must guide and settle our resolutions.”

One of your correspondents quotes Bishop Hall as bidding men go to God’s minister and “unbosom” themselves “to him freely,” “*for his fatherly advice and concurrence*”; and he seems to imagine that this makes Bishop Hall an advocate of “*Sacramental Confession*”!

Touching the Eucharist Sacrifice, Bishop Hall quotes testimonies from Augustine and many other fathers to the effect that the Sacrifice of the Altar is only the Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and adds: “This is the language and meaning of antiquity, the very same which the Tridentine Synod condemned in us—‘If any man shall say that the Sacrifice of the Mass is only a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the Sacrifice offered upon the cross, let him be accursed’”

(*The Old Religion, Works*, vol. ix. p. 258).

• • • • •

The above quotations suffice to sustain the proposition I advanced concerning the seventeenth-century divines. But to those who would investigate the subject more at length I would recommend the perusal of the following works:

Dean William Goode's work on *The Eucharist* (2 vols., 1856); *The Catholic Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, by George Trevor, Canon of York, 1876; *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist*, by Thomas Vogan, D.D., Canon of Chichester, 1871, and *Old Anglicanism and Modern Ritualism*, by Canon Meyrick, 1901. These able scholars have proved to demonstration the truth of the proposition I have advanced.

In closing this discussion I ask the reader to observe that I made no attack on the doctrines and practices of the “Catholic” party, but simply asserted that the Caroline divines acknowledged themselves Protestants; whereupon one of your correspondents rejoined that their Protestantism embraced such doctrines and practices as

Sacramental Confession, the Sacrifice of the Mass, the Real Presence, and Reservation. This was the occasion of the present controversy, which, on my part, has been intended solely as a vindication of the Protestant position of the seventeenth-century divines.

One word more. In using the designation, “The New Mediævalist Party,” I meant no offense. Their school in the Church of England is certainly new—no older than the Tractarian movement; and its doctrines are undeniably mediæval, and so acknowledged by representative men of the party. Thus a writer in the *Church and the World*, first series, says: “The whole purpose of the Great Revival has been to eliminate the dreary Protestantism of the Hanoverian period. . . . Our Churches are restored *after the mediæval pattern.*”

Would that the “Catholic” party would retreat from its advanced position and take up the position of the highest Churchmen of the Caroline period; then an era of peace and unity might dawn on the Church.

RANDOLPH H. MCKIM.

ADDENDUM

Thorndike writes in opposition to the statement that Christ's Body is present in the Eucharist:

" Seeing the flesh of Christ is taken up into heaven to sit down at Christ's right hand. . . . His Body we must understand to be confined to that place where the Majesty of God appears to those that attend upon His throne " (*Works*, A. C. L., vol. iv. part i. p. 48).

Archbishop Laud writes:

" Our Church, Art. 31, teacheth that the offering of Christ once made is sufficient. . . . Consequently condemns the Mass for the quick and the dead as blasphemous " (see Appendix to Nicholls' *On the Common Prayer*, London, 1712).

Hammond says:

" As for our Church, which only adores Christ in the *sacrament* . . . and not in the Elements themselves, nor Christ's body locally present under the shape of those elements (as certainly it cannot be, without

either being no longer in heaven, or being in more places than one at once) " (*Works*, vol. i. p. 264, London, 1684).

Bishop Andrewes says of the Eucharist:

" *Memoriam ibi fieri sacrificii damus non inviti — Sacrificii ibi Christum vestrum de pane factum, nunquam daturi.*" " That a memorial is there made of the Sacrifice we willingly grant, but that your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there, we will never grant" (*Responsio ad Bellarminum*, A. C. L., p. 251).

VIII

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE VINCENTIAN RULE OF CATHOLICITY

THE Anglican Communion has ever held herself loyal to the Catholic Church — professes, indeed, that she is part of the Catholic Church.

Her great divines and apologists have ever maintained that she stands upon Catholic ground — that her faith is the Catholic faith, that her order is Catholic order, that her Liturgy is derived from Catholic sources, that her rites and ceremonies have been established upon Catholic principles.

Thus Bishop Jewel indignantly repels the charge made by Harding, his Jesuit antagonist: “ You say we have *forsaken* the Catholic Church? Nay, we are *returned* to the Catholic Church of Christ! ” Again, he says: “ We have returned to the Apostles and the ancient Catholic Fathers ” (*Works*, iv. p. 12). In his celebrated “ Apology,” the most

authoritative defense and exposition of the faith of the English Church, he undertakes to show that the faith of that Church “is established by the words of Christ and the writings of the Apostles, and by the testimonies of the Catholic Fathers” (*Works*, iv. p. 15). It was a fundamental principle with him that “the Catholic Church of God standeth not in multitude of persons, but in weight of truth.” Yet, in his controversy with Harding, he strongly turns St. Vincent’s famous test of Catholicity against the Church of Rome, saying:

“These same notes of Lirinensis utterly overthrow the greatest part of that whole doctrine you would so fain have counted Catholic. For neither reacheth it within five hundred years of the apostolic times, nor hath it that antiquity that is . . . pretended, nor was it ever universally received. It had never that universality, neither of all times and ages, nor of all places and countries, nor was it ever universally received and allowed of all men” (*Ibid.*, iv. p. 338).

Moreover, what the Anglican apologists thus maintained, the authorized formularies of the Anglican Church plainly confirm.

The very title-page of her Prayer Book declares it. It reads: “Rites and Ceremonies of the Church”—that is, the Catholic Church—“according to the Use of the Church of England.” And in the preface added at the last revision of the Liturgy, we are told the revisers have rejected all alterations that strike at “some Established Doctrine or Laudable Practice . . . of the *whole* Catholic Church of Christ.”

What now is the test by which the English Church determines what is true Catholicity? Hear again Bishop Jewel on this point. He says: “Wherefore, if we are heretics and they are Catholics, why do they not as they see the Catholic Fathers ever did? Why do they not convince us out of the sacred Scriptures? Why do they not show that we have departed from Christ, from the prophets, from the Apostles, from the Holy Fathers?” (*Works*, iv. p. 14.)

Again he says: “Christ commandeth that whosoever will have the assurance of true faith seek to nothing else but unto the Scriptures” (*Ibid.*, iv. p. 145).

Yet again: “By this trial only (namely, searching the Scriptures) and by none other,

it (the Church) may be known" (*Works*, p. 144).

In taking this position, our great apologist had illustrious support, for St. Augustine, referring to the Scriptures, says, "*Ibi quæramus Ecclesiam,*" and again, "*Nolo humanis documentis, sed divinis oraculis, Sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari.*"

And St. Chrysostom is quoted by Bishop Jewel to the same effect: "It can in no way be known what is the Church, but only by the Scriptures" (*Ibid.*, iv. p. 144).

Precisely this is also the position of the authorized Formularies of the Anglican Church. One of her articles declares that: "Things ordained by general councils as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they are taken out of Holy Scriptures."

Even the Catholic creeds she receives only because they may be proved by most certain warrant of Holy Scripture.

She refuses to admit that even the decisions of general councils are a sufficient test of Catholicity, for she avows that "General councils may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God."

It follows that for loyal sons of the Anglican Church, the supreme test of true Catholicity of doctrine and of order must be conformity to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures. She has clearly not been of opinion that “inspired Scripture is the hieroglyphic and ecclesiastical literature its cypher.” The Fathers are not easier to understand than the Apostles. Indeed apostolic consent is less difficult to determine than patristic consent.

What, then, is the significance of her appeal to antiquity, and what is the value of the Vincentian Canon?

Clearly the Anglican Church does not recognize, in the teachings of the Fathers, an authority above Scripture, or coequal with it, but she maintains that, as a matter of fact, her teaching agrees both with Scripture and the doctrines of the early Church, and she uses this fact as a proof of the correctness of her interpretation of Holy Scripture. Thus the Fathers are for her witnesses rather than authorities — witnesses of how the Church, in the ages nearest the Apostles, interpreted the Scriptures.

The Vincentian Canon, moreover, rests

upon the underlying principle that the Church of Christ is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and where there is universal agreement among the divers centers of Church life in the primitive ages, the inference is that it has been brought about by the teaching and inspiration of the Spirit of all Truth. This canon is especially serviceable in matters upon which the Scriptural teaching may be held somewhat inconclusive, as, for example, the question of Infant Baptism and the observance of the Lord's Day. It is in effect applied to the Order of the Church in the preface to the Ordinal, where appeal is made to "Holy Scripture and ancient authors" in proof of the threefold ministry.

St. Vincent himself applies it as a touchstone to distinguish between Catholic truth and heresy. Donatism, Arianism, Pelagianism, Apollinarism, Nestorianism are successively tested and condemned by this method. Primarily and principally it is concerned with Christian doctrines, but not exclusively. It may surely be applied to such practices as are the sacramental expression of doctrines, for St. Vincent applies it to the controversy between Pope Stephen and the Bishop of

Carthage about the rebaptization of heretics (see the *Commonitorium*, chapter ix).

In chapter xxviii he says it is to be applied "especially where the Rule of Faith is concerned," but that is not to say *exclusively*.

It is sometimes said that no doctrine whatever can stand the test of *quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est*, as if St. Vincent had meant it to be interpreted *au pied de lettre*. But obviously a strictly literal interpretation was not intended, since it involves an impossibility. The agreement he had in mind was a substantial agreement of the great majority of bishops and doctors. His position is clearly stated in chapter xxvii of the *Commonitory*, as follows: "If at any time a part opposes itself to the whole, novelty to antiquity, the dissent of one or a few who are in error to the consent of all, or at all events of the great majority of Catholics, then they must prefer the soundness of the whole to the corruption of a part; in which same whole they must prefer the religion of antiquity to the profaneness of novelty; and in antiquity itself in like manner to the temerity of one or of a very few they must pre-

fer, first of all, the general decree, if such there be, of a Universal Council, or if there be no such, then what is next best, they must follow the consentient belief of many and great masters."

In chapter xxviii he limits the use of the maxim in several ways: "The opinions of those Fathers only are to be used for comparison, who, living and teaching holily, wisely, and with constancy in the Catholic Faith and Communion, were counted worthy . . . to die in the faith of Christ, whom yet we are to believe on this condition, that that only is to be accounted indubitable, certain, established, which, either all or the most part, have supported and confirmed, manifestly, frequently, persistently, in one and the same sense, forming, as it were, a consentient Council of doctors, all receiving, holding, handing on the same doctrine."

Touching the supremacy of Holy Scripture as the Rule of Faith, St. Vincent is clear: "It has always been the custom of Catholics, and still is, to prove the true faith in these two ways: first, by the authority of the Divine Canon, and next by the tradition of the Catholic Church. Not that the Canon

does not of itself suffice for every question, but seeing that the more part, interpreting the Divine Words according to their own persuasion, take up various erroneous opinions, it is therefore necessary that the interpretation of Divine Scripture should be ruled according to the one standard of the Church's belief, especially in those articles on which the foundations of all Catholic doctrine rest " (*Commonitorium*, chapter xxix).

The history of the Vincentian Canon has been a singular one. Rejected by many Protestant writers as superfluous, since the Bible is held to be its own sufficient interpreter, it has been by others valued very highly as a bulwark against novel and erroneous doctrines and practices. Already, in Elizabeth's day, Bishop Jewel challenged the Roman controversialists to meet him on the ground of this canon. He was followed in this by the illustrious Caroline divines in the next century, with great learning and distinguished success.

Even on the Continent, St. Vincent did not lack disciples among the Protestants. The Magdeburg Centuriators, for example (as has been pointed out by an able writer), in

their great historical work gave him and his method high praise.

As to the Roman controversialists, they also, at the Reformation, and long after, took their stand on the Vincentian Canon. But when criticism at length discriminated between the genuine and the spurious in patristic literature, and so revealed the fact that the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome had little, if any, real support in the primitive Fathers, a new school of Roman Theologians arose who turned away from St. Vincent and rejected his canon of Catholicity. Cardinal Newman in his Anglican days made much of the Vincentian maxim, but when he fell under the spell of the Roman Church, he ceased to see any beauty in the famous canon of Catholicity which bears the name of St. Vincent. The same change of attitude towards that time-honored rule appears to have taken place in the minds of many of the "Catholic Party" in the Anglican Church. *Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensionem*, is no longer admitted by them to be a sufficient test of Catholicity. Some of the recent communications in the Church press indicate a similar attitude of dissent from St. Vincent's maxim.

Antiquitatem is for this school no longer an essential note of Catholicity.

Nor is the change of attitude difficult to account for. Since the leaders of the school have adopted the theology of Rome to so large an extent, the same causes which led the Roman theologians to abandon the guidance of St. Vincent would naturally lead to the same abandonment by those who follow their teaching in theology.

Certain it is that the Vincentian Canon cannot by any ingenuity be made to support the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, and therefore we need not be surprised that those who have come to hold so many of those peculiar doctrines should be turning away from St. Vincent's guidance, as Newman did when he abandoned the Anglican Church.

One of their number declared a few years ago that the Vincentian Rule is "impracticable and ruinous" and in proof referred us to Newman's *Development of Christian Doctrine*, which, he says, was the last work of that writer "while yet a priest in the English Church."

But Newman himself tells us he wrote that book "in favor of the Roman Church, and

indirectly against the English" (*Apologia*, p. 221). As long as he remained firm in his allegiance to the Anglican Communion, he was an ardent expounder of the Vincentian maxim. He abandoned it only when his mind had swerved to Roman doctrine — when, to use his own expression, he was on his death-bed — as regards membership in the Anglican Church (*Ibid.*, p. 187).

IX

TRUE AND FALSE CATHOLICITY

THE earliest forms of the Christian Creed that have come down to us did not enumerate among the credenda the article of the Holy Catholic Church. The first record of this article of belief is in the private Creed of Arius, A. D. 328.¹ "I believe," he wrote, "in one Catholic Church of God which extends to the ends of the earth." It is a curious — some will think a suggestive — fact, that Arius, the greatest heresiarch of all the ages, made the "One Catholic Church" an article of his Creed, — while Ignatius,² Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Gregory, Eusebius, even

¹ The Creed adopted at Nicaea A. D. 325, did not contain this article. The earliest form of the Apostles' Creed is given by Rufinus, A. D. 390, and the article therein is, "I believe in the Holy Church."

² Ignatius indeed applies the word to the Church in his famous phrase, "Where is Christ Jesus, there is the Catholic Church," but, as Lightfoot has shown, he there uses the word in its earliest sense as equivalent to "universal," with which sense we are not concerned in this discussion. At any rate, the word is not in his creed.

Cyprian did not! Moreover, the Arians boasted that they were the true Catholics, upon which Bishop Jewel remarks that it is a familiar trick of heretics to boast themselves Catholics. We do well, then, when we go into the ecclesiastical market in quest of Catholicity, to examine critically the doctrines and practices labeled with that august name, to see whether they bear the hall-mark of the genuine article.

What, then, is true Catholicity? I may remark in advance that we are not concerned with Catholicity in its earliest sense as equivalent to "Universal," *e. g.*, "the Catholic Resurrection," but in its later sense, which, as Bishop Lightfoot has shown in his monumental work on the Ignatian Epistles, implies "orthodoxy as opposed to heresy, conformity as opposed to dissent." "Catholic truth is the same everywhere. . . . The heresies were partial, scattered, localized, isolated."

The first instance of this technical use of the word occurs in the famous Muratorian Fragment, A. D. 170, where it is said that heretical writings cannot be received in the Catholic Church (*In Catholicam Ecclesiam*

recipi non potest). The earliest of the Fathers who makes similar use of the word is Clement of Alexandria. Athanasius speaks of "the Catholic Church which is in every place." Centuries later, in the so-called Athanasian Creed, we have a similar use of the word in the expression, "The Catholic Religion," — "The Catholic Faith."

The Christian Emperors undertook to define true Catholicity. Thus in the year of our Lord 380 Theodosius issued a decree ordaining that only those who accepted the doctrine of the Trinity as expounded in the Nicene symbol should be called Catholic Christians (*Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum Catholicorum nomen jubemus amplecti*) (see Gieseler, 3d edition, Sec. 81, p. 105).¹

Perhaps the best definition of Catholicity ever drawn is that given by Vincent of

¹ "Hoc est ut secundum apostolicam disciplinam evangelicamque doctrinam Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti unam deitatem sub parili majestate et sub pia trinitate credamus. *Hanc legem sequentes Christianorum catholicorum nomen jubemus amplecti*, reliquos vero dementes vesanosque judicantes hæretici dogmatis infamiam sustinere, nec conciliabula eorum ecclesiarum nomen accipere, divina primum vindicta, post etiam motus nostri, quem ex cælesti arbitrio sumserimus, ultione plectendos."

Lerins. Adopting that for the purposes of this discussion, I lay down these propositions:

1. If the Church in any age propound any doctrine, or article of Faith contrary to Holy Scripture, or in conflict with the Creed of the first age of the Church, true Catholicity requires us to reject such doctrine.

2. If the Church in any age add any article of Faith to the Creed of the New Testament, true Catholicity requires us to refuse such doctrine a place among the articles of the Catholic Faith, even though we should be convinced that it is a true inference from the Scriptures, or a true development of some Catholic truth.

3. If the Church in any age, or theological writers in any age, reject any article of the Faith of the New Testament and the Primitive Church — for example, the Virgin-birth of Jesus Christ and His bodily Resurrection — then true Catholicity requires us to challenge such denial as a breach of the Catholic Faith.

These three propositions rest upon the unquestionable principle that — taking as our canon of Catholicity the *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus, creditum est* —

the “semper” must include the first age, the “ubique” must include Palestine, and the “ab omnibus” must include Christ and the Apostles. It is absolutely and undeniably certain that nothing can be Catholic which contradicts the teaching, or contravenes the example, of Christ and His Apostles.

But there are other cardinal propositions in this discussion.

4. The true Catholic must become a Protestant when the one Faith once delivered is imperiled either by addition or diminution.

The Fathers of Nicæa were Protestants against the heresy of Arius when they enunciated the Nicene Creed. The Fathers of the English Reformation were Protestants against the heresies and usurpations of the Church of Rome, when they threw off the yoke of that Church and established the Reformed Liturgy of the Church of England. Thus the Church of England, in order to remain Catholic, was compelled to become Protestant. And today her Protestantism is an indispensable note of her true Catholicity.

5. I add a fifth rule of Catholicity. The true Catholic recognizes the authority of each particular national Church over its

members, and acknowledges the obligation of conformity to its Formularies and obedience to its laws. There is no principle which more completely comes up to St. Vincent's test of Catholicity than this. It has been acknowledged *semper, ubique, ab omnibus*, that each particular branch of the Catholic Church has authority "to ordain, change, or abolish Ceremonies or Rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority."

This position is strongly affirmed by the Anglican Church in her authorized Formularies. Hooker says her principle in the Reformation was "not to alter unnecessarily the ancient received customs of the whole Church, the universal received practice of the people of God" (IV. xiv. [4], p. 484). But he also affirms that "neither councils nor customs, be they never so ancient and so general," can bind the Church if she judges the things in question to be hurtful. Thus true Catholicity affirms the power of each particular branch of the Church to be "in every age entire and as great as it was in any one age" since the Apostles (Burnet, *On the Articles*, p. 488). And the true Catholic, if he thinks his own particular Church has

erred in her decisions, is nevertheless bound by those decisions, so far as they are embodied in her Canons, Rubrics, and Formularies. He is free to agitate for their change according to his ideas of Catholic usage, but until they are changed by lawful authority he is bound to conform to them. If he does not, he flagrantly violates the rule of true Catholicity.

I note also as a corollary to this fifth proposition that for us in the United States the authoritative standard of Catholicity in rites and ceremonies is the Liturgy, Offices, and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church. The Prayer Book is as close an approximation to true Catholicity as the wit and the learning and the devotion of man have ever devised. I do not feel as the Tractarians did, that we are doing penance in using it, hoping for a better day, when a more catholic Liturgy would be established. I rejoice and glory in it as the most truly Catholic Liturgical Formulary in Christendom. Its offices and none others am I bound by my vows to use. Its rubrics and none others must I observe. The Ornaments Rubric of the Church of England, whatever it means,

has no force in this Church. For it is a well-settled principle of constitutional law that “When a code in force under a prior system is reënacted with omissions, this implies that the omissions, unless merely verbal, are declarations that what is prescribed or forbidden by the omitted clauses under the old system, is *not* prescribed or forbidden under the new system.”¹

A learned authority of our own communion, Dr. Francis Wharton, has clearly shown that “the only rubrics binding our American Episcopal Church are those which have been adopted as part of our American Episcopal Prayer Book.”² The legislature of the English Church and of the Ancient Church has what jurists call “auctoritatem,” but not “potestatem”—that is to say, “it instructs, but does not control.”

Otherwise we should have the English Canons on our necks, as well as the Eucharistic vestments on our backs—canon 74, for instance, requiring the clergy to wear

¹ See Dr. F. Wharton in *Perry's History of American Episcopal Church*, vol. ii. p. 390.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 394–397.

“gowns with hoods or tippets of silk or sarsenet,” forbidding the wearing of light-colored stockings, and enjoining nightcaps of black silk, satin, or velvet! So, if we *will* have “the ornaments Rubric” over us, we must also have the Canons over us. And if that Rubric really legalizes the Eucharistic vestments, then the Ecclesiastical Law has joined together the alb and the chasuble and the cope, with the gowns and the tippets, and the black nightcaps,—and let no consistent ritualist put them asunder!

Then there is the 55th Canon, requiring the clergy to use the bidding prayer before all sermons—that too is binding if the Ornaments Rubric is binding—and our friends who love to preface even their extempore sermonettes with the solemn and august Invocation of the Blessed Trinity, will be in duty bound to give over a custom so dear to their hearts! Then, too, the same principle will tie us to the Canons of Nicæa, and we shall be forbidden ever again to kneel in prayer on the Lord’s Day—but must stand, like good Presbyterian Catholics!

It is true our Preface says there was no intention on the part of the revisers to depart

from the Church of England in any essential point of worship. It follows that since they omitted the Ornaments Rubric they did not consider it involved any essential point of worship.

6. A sixth rule whereby true Catholicity may be distinguished from pseudo-Catholicity is that the ancient Fathers are to be listened to rather as witnesses to Catholic and Apostolic doctrine and practice than as authorities whose opinions or doctrinal statements are binding upon the Church. It follows that the writings of the more ancient Fathers are the more valuable, because their testimony is nearer the inspired source of truth. Jewel had this in mind when he said: "Verily five hundred of those first years are worth more than the whole thousand years that followed afterward" (iv. p. 211). Again he says that Harding, the Roman apologist, had claimed for his Church "a thousand years of the night, and hath left us nigh six hundred years of the day" (iv. p. 337).

Let us proceed to apply these principles. And first I cite examples of doctrines which all of us will agree lack the hall-mark of true Catholicity:

1. The dogma of Papal Infallibility possesses none of the notes of a Catholic doctrine,—neither the *semper*, nor the *ubique*, nor the *ab omnibus*. It was never heard of till the middle ages, it was never defined till the year 1870, it was promulgated by a Council that had no claim to be called œcuménical, and it is rejected by the Greek Church, by the Anglican Communion, in short, by all Christians except the members of the Roman Communion.

2. Or take the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin. We pronounce it un-Catholic for the same reason. It is only less novel and modern than Papal Infallibility. It is a doctrine entirely unknown to the Ancient Church. It was strenuously combated, in former times, by the most eminent of Papal theologians, among them Cardinal de Turrecremata and St. Thomas Aquinas. It cannot even be called “Roman Catholic,” since fourteen of the Popes are said to have pronounced against it, including Popes Leo, Gelastius, Gregory the Great, and Innocent III.

3. The same principles must brand any doctrine of Papal Supremacy as un-Catholic,

since there is general agreement among the Fathers of the Ante-Nicene period that all Bishops, as successors of the Apostles, had coequal power and authority. Bossuet indeed, the eagle of Meaux, says that the doctrine that the Bishops of the Church receive their jurisdiction from the Pope is a late invention, unheard of for twelve centuries.

4. By the same rule Transubstantiation, Purgatory, and Mariolatry we reject as un-Catholic.

5. Turn now to doctrines of a different type — which take from, instead of adding to, the Catholic Faith of the Church — for instance, the denial of the Virgin-birth of Jesus Christ and of the objective fact of His Resurrection. The writers of that remarkable series of *Essays in Constructive Theology* entitled *Contentio Veritatis*, “ plead for the admissibility of a belief in Christ’s Divinity which is virtually independent of such miracles as the Virgin-birth and the Resurrection.” They would throw the ægis of their justly high authority over a Creed which, while nominally professing the Christian Faith, yet calls in question, and even repudiates some of the facts upon which that Faith

rests as a foundation. Now, whether such a Creed may still claim to be called in some sort a Christian Creed or no, I hope we will be all but unanimously agreed that it is not the Catholic Creed, since it has let go its hold upon two articles of belief which the Catholic Church has held from the beginning,—articles which are Catholic by every test, the *semper*, the *ubique*, the *ab omnibus*,—articles which rest upon the authority of Holy Scripture, of primitive antiquity, and of the œcumenical Councils.

So far I anticipate general agreement on the part of those to whom I speak. But now I enter upon ground which by some of you will probably be considered debatable.

There is a great deal, both in doctrine and in practice, in teaching and in ritual, which has been put forward for more than a generation, both in England and in our own country, as based upon Catholic consent and Catholic usage, which appears to me plainly un-Catholic,—destitute, in fact, of the distinctive features which I hold to be absolutely necessary to the claim to Catholicity. The Tractarians, Newman and his followers, made their appeal to the primitive church. The writings of the

ancient Fathers furnished their standard of Catholicity.

But the leaders of the self-styled Catholic Party today (at least of its most aggressive wing) have changed the court of appeal. Since Newman discovered that the doctrine and practices of the Church of Rome could not be supported by the early Fathers, and had recourse to the doctrine of Development as a refuge from his dilemma, the school, of which he was in his Anglican days the idolized leader, seems to have gradually shifted its ground until today its standard of Catholicity is found not in the Nicene age, but in our own age—in the teaching and practice of what its adherents call the Catholic Church, by which is meant not, of course, the Church of England, not the Greek Church—and not, in terms, the Roman Church, but a kind of undefined entity made up of all these branches of the Church. And (*mirabile dictu!*) the judge who decides what this Catholic Church teaches in doctrine ritual and ceremony, is the individual priest who makes the appeal. In fact, the answer to the appeal is “the echo of the appealing voice”—and so it comes to pass that we have a code of

so-called Catholic doctrines and ceremonies suggestive of Babel rather than of Pentecost. In practice, however, there is one unifying principle which saves the party from utter confusion, and that is that the doctrine, the customs, the ritual of the Church of Rome are generally taken as the standard of Catholicity.

It does not admit of doubt — it is frankly confessed by many of the neo-Catholics in the Church of England — that men of this school in increasing numbers feel so strongly their obligation to accept the doctrines and follow the customs of what they call the Catholic Church, that loyalty to their own national Church, and to its doctrines and Liturgy and Canons is no longer paramount — has been relegated, in fact, to a secondary place. They are first “Catholics” and then Anglicans, and if the Anglican Liturgy or the Anglican Formularies or the Anglican ceremonies are not in harmony with their conception of Catholicity, then these must be interpreted in a Catholic sense, or, if this is impossible, must be set aside and superseded by those which have a higher obligation on their consciences.

Lord Halifax, in a recent address as President of the English Church Union, distinctly takes this ground. For example, he held that in the case of Reservation, even, if the Rubrics do forbid it, "the prohibition is not one which it is within the competence of any local church to make." He deliberately takes the ground that "those who hold the national Church to which they belong to have diverged ill-advisedly from Catholic custom," instead of being bound by the explicit rules of their Church until those rules are altered by legal authority, "are dispensed from obedience by loyalty to the higher claims of the Catholic Church; and of this dispensation the individual is to be the judge" (*Guardian*, July 2, 1902, p. 946). His position has been well stated thus: "Lord Halifax seems to have abandoned the attempt at interpreting the Reformation and the Prayer Book in a Catholic sense, and to argue that, as it is impossible to square them with Catholic doctrine and Catholic usages, in respect, *e.g.*, to the Sacrament of the Altar, we must condemn the one and ignore the other, and revive solitary masses in the teeth of the explicit prohibition of the Rubric" (*Ibid.*, June 18).

Now, such a principle as this is not only completely subversive of order and authority and unity in the Church, but it is clearly and flagrantly un-Catholic. In the name of obedience to Catholic doctrine and usage, one of the first principles of Catholic usage, all over the world, is ruthlessly trampled upon. For there is high authority for the statement that "Conformity to authorized formularies is a known law and custom of the Holy Catholic Church"—that "such conformity has been the unbroken and constant tradition and usage of the Holy Catholic Church"—and that to act otherwise is a distinct repudiation of the Catholic standpoint.¹ With equal emphasis it may be affirmed that Catholic custom has from the beginning, and until the Roman Church usurped to itself powers which rightfully she could not exercise, recognized the authority of national churches over their members in all matters save only the One Faith once delivered to the saints and embodied in the Catholic Creeds.

It is therefore a breach of Catholicity for any clergyman of either of these national churches to set aside the liturgical For-

¹ *True Limits of Ritual in the Church*, pp. 49, 50.

mularies, the Rubries, the Canons, or the customs of said churches because they do not agree with *his* idea of what is Catholic.

Let me now cite some examples of the working of the leaven of this un-Catholic principle of self-dispensation from conformity to the Liturgy of a particular national Church by assuming the higher claims of the Catholic Church. They shall be taken exclusively from England, and the testimony upon which they rest is the published writings of English clergymen who are themselves advocates of the Six Points of Orthodox Ritualism.

1. The interpolation in the course of the Canonical Offices of extraneous features taken from some other rite.
2. The omission of structural parts of the offices of the Prayer Book.
3. The substitution of other Collects, Epistles, and Gospels for those ordered for the day.
4. The introduction of Liturgical Offices in their entirety from the use or rite of another church.

So far has this principle gone that one of the ritualistic clergymen alluded to tells us

that the clergy feel at liberty to mutilate or embellish, to supplement or supersede, the offices of the Prayer Book at will.

Such Roman services as “The Tenebræ,” “The Creeping to the Cross,” and “The Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament” are used in some English Churches. Thus the English and the Roman rites are “harnessed together,” to the confusion of them both.

There goes along with all this a spirit of contemptuous dissatisfaction with the Prayer Book. Its claim to Catholic authority is seriously questioned. A priest who is particular in the observance of the Rubrics and requirements of his own national Liturgy is spoken of superciliously as “Prayer-booky.” The First Prayer Book of Edward VI (which bears about the same relation to our Authorized Book as the “Articles of Confederation” bear to the “Constitution of the United States”) is exalted above that Book which all of us have solemnly promised to obey, and the “use of Sarum,” which has been entirely superseded by the Law of the Church, is still more highly venerated as an authority and a guide in the public service of the Church. It is even denied that the Prayer

Book has the same authority for us as the Missal and Breviary have in the Latin rite. No, it is a manual mainly for the use of the lay folk—a Paroissien. The Church in using it is like a captive in bondage. She is doing penance, hoping for a better day. The result of all this is that we have in the Church, under the name of a Catholic Revival, “on the one hand a mass of burdensome additions and on the other a tangled undergrowth of self-willed creepers.”¹

Whatever may be the cause and whoever may be responsible for it—and I am quite willing to admit that the fault is not all on one side—the Church of England, and in a measure our own, presents, as to her forms of service, her Ritual, and her religious ceremonies, a spectacle at variance with that first principle of true Catholicity,—obedience to law and conformity to established order. It is confessed by devout ritualists that, “in her darkest hour of Erastian servility and Protestant apathy and misrule, she did not exhibit, so far as her prescript order of Divine Service is concerned, an exterior more utterly at variance with the spirit and prin-

¹ *True Limits of Ritual*, p. 204.

ciple of "Catholic custom than she does at the present moment."¹

Thus we have the strange spectacle of a considerable body of the clergy who make the principle of Catholic consent the standard of their faith and teaching, adopting the absolutely un-Catholic principle of the liberty of the individual priest to ignore, or to mutilate, or to set aside the order of service which his own branch of the Catholic Church has established, and to which he has promised conformity.

Surely in the presence of a practice so destructive of all order and unity and peace, High Churchmen, Low Churchmen, and Broad Churchmen ought to make common cause for the defense of the Church against disintegration. And Ritualists also, men who hold and practice every one of the Six Points — and to whom the principle of Catholic consent is dear — ought to unite in the effort to rebuke and abate this most un-Catholic practice. The eight well-known representatives of the Ritualist School who united some years ago in the volume of essays entitled *True Limits of Ritual in the Church* may be pointed

¹ *True Limits of Ritual*, p. 56.

to as leaders who have taken alarm at the portentous growth among men of their school of this form of pseudo-Catholicity.

May their warning and appeal not be lost upon their ritualistic brethren in America!

There are several other practices which are put forward as under the ægis of Catholic authority and usage which have no claim whatever to so high a lineage, even were we to grant that what prevailed in the Primitive Church down to the date of the Council of Nice (A. D. 325) might, in a qualified sense, be called "Catholic." But, as time does not permit more, I will simply ask to be instructed upon the following points:

1. How can Eucharistic Adoration be either primitive or Catholic, when, as Palmer and Freeman have shown, the Ancient Liturgies contain no trace of any such practice — when, in fact, it was not practiced in the Christian Church for eleven hundred years after Christ?

2. How can non-communicating attendance be a Catholic custom, when, to quote Mr. Maskell's words, "It is so well known that, during the first five centuries at least, the universal practice was to allow no one to

be present except communicants, and the last class of penitents, that it would be a waste of time to repeat authorities that have been cited over and over again ”?

3. How can the custom of receiving the Holy Communion fasting be vindicated as a Catholic practice, when our Lord and his Apostles did not receive fasting; when there is no evidence that in the first three centuries there was any such requirement;¹ when, as eminent Roman Catholic authorities acknowledge, “for the first three centuries, and even much later, it was still in many places celebrated after supper”? “Even in the fifth century,” says Johnson, author of *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, “whole churches chose to have their Communion in the evening and upon a full stomach.”

That we may see to what lengths of presumption pseudo-Catholicism can go, it is only necessary to quote the statement that the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in the evening, when He Himself celebrated it—and when, as Father Puller confesses, the early Church did continually—is an act of “intolerable profanity”! To this com-

¹ That is, no canon enjoining it.

plexion it has come, that to follow the example of the Master and the Martyrs is profanity! Such a sentiment, let it be plainly said, resembles blasphemy much more than it does Catholicity.

4. How can the discipline of private Confession and Absolution be a Catholic practice, when it is undeniable that it did not exist in the primitive Church?

I make this statement advisedly, for at the Round Table Conference, held in Fulham Palace, in 1901–2, at the request of the Bishop of London,—a conference representing all schools of churchmanship, and in which the most conspicuous leaders of the Ritualistic party participated,—one of the few things upon which there was unanimous agreement was this:

“The members of the Conference are agreed that the discipline of private Confession and Absolution cannot be shown to have existed for some centuries after the foundation of the Church” (*Report*, p. 109).

I ask, then, to be enlightened upon the point, How can that be a Catholic practice which was unknown in the Church during its earliest and best centuries? If this be Catho-

licity, it is not the Catholicity of Christ and the Apostles.

5. How can the use of incense be Catholic, if it be true, as the Lower House of Convocation declared on June 29, 1866, that "there is no proof of its use in the Apostolic Age"? Moreover, the President and Council of the English Church Union, August 16, the same year, officially declared their acquiescence in the said *Report*.

6. How can the use of unleavened wafer bread be Catholic, when it is certain, from the best authorities, that unleavened bread was not used even in the Roman Church till the seventh century? In the early Church common bread was used except by the Ebionite heretics, and as the learned liturgiologist, Palmer, tells us, "it has always been the practice of the Christian Church to place the bread on the table whole and unbroken." But is the use of wafer bread *permissible* in the English Church today in face of the Canon of 1604 and the Rubric of 1661, requiring that the Communion bread shall "be such as is usual to be eaten"?

It is true wafer bread was permitted by the Rubrics of the First Prayer Book of Ed-

ward VI, but that book has been superseded both in England and in America, and true Catholicity requires us to follow the Rubrics of our lawful standards, just as true citizenship requires Americans to obey the Constitution of the United States and not the Articles of Confederation.

It is true also that Queen Elizabeth's injunctions required the use of wafers, but it were Erastianism rather than true Catholicism to regulate our rites and ceremonies in connection with the Holy Sacrament of our Redemption by the secular authority!

To sum up, my answer to the question, What is Catholicity? is this:

True Catholicity, as I see it, is the Catholicity of Jewel and Hooker, of Jeremy Taylor and Andrewes and Cosin, of Bull and Beveridge and Bramhall, of Ussher and Hall and Pearson,—theirs, I say, and not the Catholicity of Keble and Pusey and Liddon and Mackonochie, or of Lord Halifax and the English Church Union.

These men did not repudiate the Protestant position of the Church of England. No, they justified it, they defended it, they gloried in it. The Reformation was, in their eyes, a

purification that had become imperative in order to save Catholic truth. As Jeremy Taylor puts it: "The Church of England looked in the glass of Scripture and pure antiquity, and washed away those stains with which time and inadvertency and tyranny had besmeared her." Even Archbishop Laud declared that he held to "the true Protestant Religion established in the Church of England."¹ They are known as the Anglo-Catholic divines, and I ask you to remember that neither private Masses, nor non-communicating attendance, nor sacramental confession, nor adoration of the elements, nor elevation of the elements, nor invocation of saints, nor Litanies to the Virgin, nor Purgatory, nor the doctrine of Seven Sacraments found any countenance or any toleration from them. Bishop Andrewes says, "for more than a thousand years the number of Seven Sacraments was never heard of. How, then, can the belief in Seven Sacraments be Catholic, which means 'always believed'?"

¹ Laud said the Protestants did not make the rent in the Church. The Romanists were the cause of the schism. He declared purgatory was not a primitive doctrine, nor communion in one kind, nor worship of images, nor transubstantiation.

Yet with one voice they declared themselves "Catholics." In his answer to Cardinal Bellarmine, Bishop Andrewes says, "There is no part of the Catholic Faith that we do not hold." "We are Catholic, not Roman." "We accept without hesitation Vincentius Lerinensis' definition, *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. That rule of itself is the death of all your opinions which have crept in surreptitiously." They declared themselves "satisfied with the old Catholic Faith without the new patches of Rome." They appealed to the ancients, to the furthest antiquity, to the first four general councils.

Let me, in concluding, endeavor to express in a word what seems to me the vital difference between true Catholicity and false.

Both turn to the past, aspiring to be in touch with the One Church once builded by the Lord, and to hold fast the One Faith once delivered. But they are animated by a different spirit, and they incarnate widely different ideas. Pseudo-Catholicity, in one of its forms, not content to establish and maintain continuity with the ages behind us, would imitate the past by a slavish conformity, bows

down to it, is in bondage to it, looks back to it as the golden age, has no higher ideal than to reproduce it. In another form it turns indeed to the past, but not to the primitive past. It is in love with the middle ages; it almost obliterates the *Antiquitatem* from the Vincentian Canon.

But true Catholicity seeks rather to understand the spirit of the past, and to learn how that spirit may be applied to the changed conditions of the world and of the Church. It would learn of the past all it can teach, but it would not bow down to it, or be in bondage to it. It walks erect as the heir of the same promises and of the same Divine Guidance which the Fathers enjoyed. True Catholicity may be described, not as a reproduction of the past, but as a living growth out of the past, incarnating the same immemorial principles, but in a new form adapted to its own day and generation. It remembers its obligations to the present as well as to the past. It would be a living organism, not a fossil. It would keep in touch with Humanity, with the progress of man, with the new ideas of order and liberty, of social justice and human rights; because, though it recog-

nizes the “fullness and beauty of the religious temper of past ages,” it has “got rid of the dead hand,” it does not allow “the freedom of the life of man in God to be smothered in the formularies and traditions of the past.”

This conception of Catholicity, I beg to remind you, is perfectly consistent with a true interpretation of the rule of St. Vincent. He himself foresaw that his rule might be supposed to be incompatible with progress of thought, with larger and fuller understanding of revealed truth; and he guards against it in these words: “But perchance some one says: Is there, then, to be no progress of religion in the Church of Christ? Let there be, certainly, and that to the highest degree — provided only it be progress, not change, of faith.”¹

NOTE ON THE WORKING OF THE PSEUDO-CATHOLIC PRINCIPLE IN ENGLAND

The work to which I refer is entitled *True Limits of Ritual in the Church*, edited by Rev. R. Linklater, D.D., Longmans, Green &

¹ *Commonitorium*, i. chapter xxiii.

Co., 1899. One of these writers says (*Ibid.*, p. 67) that many Priests are in the habit of “interpolating in the course of the authorized and Canonical Offices of extraneous features, either as acts of private devotion on the part of the officiating minister, or as part of the public service.” He characterizes this as a very “wide departure from Catholic tradition and universal Catholic custom.”

Again he says: “It has become quite common to supplement the Canonical Offices—and on the most solemn days of the year—with Liturgical Offices borrowed in their entirety from the use or rite of another church. This is a perfectly new departure from previous Catholic tradition and present œcumeneical usage alike” (*Ibid.*, p. 70).

And again: “What strikes one as so utterly foreign to universal usage is that the Liturgical Office of one ‘Use’ should be borrowed at the will of the individual priest to supplement, or even supersede, the offices of his own rite. That surely is, in the strict sense of the word, ‘uncatholic’” (*Ibid.*, p. 71).

By the same authority we are told that “all sorts of offices, not only liturgical, but

of a popular and devotional character," are adopted "in direct antagonism to the very spirit of Catholic tradition" (*Ibid.*, p. 91).

Indeed, so far has this principle gone, that the clergy feel at liberty "to mutilate or embellish, to supplement or supersede, the offices" of the Prayer Book at will.

For examples he cites the introduction of the Roman services of "The Tenebræ," the "Creeping to the Cross," and "the Vespers of the Blessed Sacrament" (p. 82).

Another ritualistic writer who deplores the lawless excesses of many of his school tells us of the introduction into the public services of the English Church of "variable parts of the Roman Liturgy, such as Graduals, Secrets, Communions, post-Communions, and the like, which the English Church deliberately laid aside in order to secure simplicity of form; and, by the secret or open recitation of the Latin Canon, repeating thereby that which is sufficiently provided for in the English Liturgy, and excluding the people from active participation in all that the priest does" (*Ibid.*, p. 222). Thus the English and the Roman Rites are "harnessed together" to the confusion of them both.

Moreover, there is a distinct principle of affiliation that, we are told, rules all these manifold self-willed departures from the English Rite. Ceremonial is introduced, "the sole use of which sometimes appears to be to revive mediævalism in all its nakedness, or else to set forth visibly our entire oneness with our Continental brethren" (*Ibid.*, p. 209).

By reason of the license and lawlessness which are practiced by many, both by unauthorized omissions and by unauthorized additions, "the conditions of public worship in the Church of England are quite unlike those of the rest of Christendom" (p. 60). "Rightly or wrongly, a new departure has been made, not only from the custom of the English Church, but *from that of the whole of the rest of Christendom.*" "Nothing at all resembling what is referred to is to be found in any other part of the Catholic Church" (p. 64). The liberties taken with the prescript order have no support in Canon Law, or in the custom of the Church from time immemorial. They are in truth a flagrant violation of every Catholic principle.

Another of these writers, discussing the

practice of "saying the Service in a tongue or a tone not heard of the people," says: "The real reason might seem to be a presumption that whatever is done on the Continent is right, an unconscious harking back to a lower type of religion" (*Ibid.*, p. 210).

And yet another contributor to the same volume says: "Those to whom authority is dear should demand a reformation before that principle is utterly lost" (p. 60).

Such utterances as these by avowed Ritualists, alarmed by the excesses of men of their own school, are surely very significant.

X

DOCTRINES AND PRACTICES ERRONEOUSLY CALLED CATHOLIC

I COME now to a matter of capital importance. It is sometimes asserted that St. Vincent's rule of Catholicity is applicable only to doctrines and "has nothing to do with practices." I meet this by a *positive denial*.

There are many practices which may be called the sacramental expression of doctrines, and to these the tests of Universitatem, Antiquitatem, Consensionem, may certainly be applied. St. Vincent himself in his *Commonitorium* (chapter ix) applies it to the practice of rebaptizing heretics. It was applied by the Roman theologians in the Reformation age to both doctrine and practice. It was broadly applied also by the Anglican apologists, notably Bishop Jewel, by the Tractarians in the last century, and by many others.¹ It is even applied to rites

¹ The appeal to Antiquity was specially characteristic of the English Reformation, and great divines of the English

and ceremonies as such, as in the following passage from the writings of a good Ritualist, the Rev. Dr. W. F. Cobb, Assistant Secretary of the English Church Union. He says: “ If we be asked to make a list of ‘ Catholic ceremonies ’ which satisfy the test of *quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*, we can give but one answer — that we know of none, if we use the word ‘ ceremony ’ in the accepted sense of an external act of worship with its adjuncts. It would be a hazardous assertion that so venerable a ceremony as making the sign of the cross is of Apostolic origin. . . . From this it clearly follows that we have no right to try and impose as ‘ Catholic ceremonies ’ things which all just stop short of the desired hall-mark, however desirable and edifying and ancient they may be.”

The great Bishop Andrewes, in his *Responsio ad Bellarminum*, applies the Vincentian Canon to questions of the Primacy of the Pope, the Communion in one kind (a practice), and to the number of the sacraments — Church have throughout urged this test of doctrines and rites in their conflicts both with Rome and with Nonconformity. The Tractarians laid peculiar stress upon it. (Vincent H. Stanton, D.D., *Place of Authority*, p. 170.)

whether two or seven. Indeed that illustrious company of Anglo-Catholic divines of the seventeenth century challenged the Roman controversialists to meet them on the ground of St. Vincent's maxim. They applied it all along the line to the chief matters at issue. Andrewes stated it very broadly thus: "That which has *prevailed* always and everywhere, and among all, that which has been *believed* always, everywhere, and by all — let that be Catholic! That rule of itself is the death of all your opinions which have crept in surreptitiously."

In another place he suggests even a broader definition of Catholicity: "For more than a thousand years the number of seven sacraments was never heard of. How, then, can the belief in seven sacraments be Catholic, which means always believed?"

Now, my six questions are modeled on this question of Bishop Andrewes, and the test of Catholicity I would apply is the same as his, and every one of the practices to which they referred is the expression of some doctrine.

Thus the assertion that St. Vincent's maxim "has nothing to do with practices"

is challenged by the authority of Newman in his Anglican days, by the Tractarian writers generally, by the Anglo-Catholic divines of the Caroline period, by the apologists of the Church of England in the Elizabethan period, by the Roman controversialists of that time, and down to the time of Petavius, and by the example of St. Vincent himself, who applies it to refute those who turned away from “the practice and institutions of the ancient Fathers” (*Commonitorium*, chapter ix).

We hold that Rites and Ceremonies, Liturgies, Offices of Public Service, Ritual, Ecclesiastical vestments, and the like, are subject to the authority of each particular National Church. For example, the Church, in the twentieth century, has authority to disregard, yea, to nullify, that canon of the great Council of Nicæa which forbade Christian people to kneel on their knees in prayer on the Lord’s Day. We in the United States are bound, in all these matters, not by the decrees of ancient Councils, but by the order taken by our own church.

Coming now to the statement already made that Eucharistic Adoration was not

practiced in the Church for eleven hundred years after Christ, I desire to buttress that assertion by the authority of a writer who stands in the front rank of liturgical and patristic scholars of the nineteenth century, Archdeacon Freeman. In his monumental work, *The Principles of Divine Service* (vol. ii. p. 185), he says "the practice of making an intense act of worship consequent on the consecration of the elements and directed toward a peculiar Presence of Christ Himself, supposed to be produced thereby," was "*unheard of until the eleventh or twelfth century.*" Palmer also, in his *Origines Liturgicæ* (vol. ii. p. 16), says: "The elevation of the Sacrament for the purpose of adoration was not practiced in the Christian Church for eleven hundred years after Christ."

Appeal is made indeed to certain passages from several of the Fathers of the fourth century which it is thought establish the practice of Eucharistic Adoration at that period. Augustine says: "*No one eats that Flesh unless he first adores.*" Adores what, or whom, I ask? Let Jeremy Taylor answer for us: "*Nemo digne man-*

ducat nisi prius adoravit," said St. Augustine: "No man eats Christ's Body worthily but he that first *adores* Christ!" That this is the true meaning of the passage is established by the words of St. Augustine elsewhere: "Now He says, 'Except you eat of the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, ye shall have no life in you.' This seems to command an evil and wicked thing; *therefore it is a figure*, commanding us to partake of Christ's passion, keeping in our minds to our great comfort and profit, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us" (*De Doctrina Christi*, I. iii. c. 4, quoted by Bishop Jewel).

The passage from St. Cyril falls equally short of the meaning put upon it. As Freeman remarks, "it is only to the effect that the elements are to be received in a posture of Adoration." Some say *κύπτων* "implies a bodily act of worship." I submit that it simply implies bending the body—not kneeling, an expression of reverence and nothing more. What follows? This: "bending and saying in the way of worship, *Amen*" (so Archdeacon Freeman renders it); or this: "bending and saying with an

air of reverence and worship, *Amen*'' (so translated in the Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers). The words λέγων τὸ Ἀμήν (saying Amen) qualify τρόπῳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ σεβάσματος (by way of reverence and worship), and thereby change the sense.

I have quoted Archdeacon Freeman, but he is only one of many authorities. The great Anglo-Catholic theologians of the seventeenth century stand upon the same ground. Bishop Cosin says the Adoration of the Elements "is a late device of the new Roman Catholics after they had brought in their novelty of transubstantiation." Jeremy Taylor declares this Adoration "an act of idolatry in giving divine honor to a mere creature," He adds: "If it had been intended we should worship the Holy Sacrament, the Holy Scriptures would have . . . bidden us in express terms to have adored it"; and he further cautions his readers not to be "abused by the rhetorical words and high expressions alleged out of the Fathers." That caution is as necessary in the twentieth century as it was in the seventeenth.

Bishop Andrewes also "carefully distin-

guishes the ‘veneration due to the symbols from the divine adoration belonging to Christ.’” “He censures Bellarmine’s expression of ‘adoring Christ in the Sacrament,’ as a ‘shameful stumble on the threshold.’” He refers to the passage quoted from St. Ambrose, and says: “We also ‘adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries,’ yet not that thing (*id*), but Him (*eum*), who above (not upon) the Altar is worshiped” (*Resp. ad Bellarminum*).

Let the words of Canon Trevor be pondered: “Nothing is read of Eucharistic Adoration in the purest ages, beyond receiving the elements in a posture of reverence scarcely equal to our own order of kneeling” (*The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 237).

And now let it be said that the five brief passages alleged from the Greek and Latin Fathers of the fourth century are absolutely all that even the learning of Muratori has been able to discover, in the whole vast mass of patristic literature, which give any appearance of support to Eucharistic Adoration. They constitute a frail foundation indeed for so tremendous a doctrine — for

the practice cannot be separated from the doctrine. Two of them really do not touch the question at issue. The others are ambiguous because the words *adorare* and *προσκύνειν* are of ambiguous import, not necessarily implying the worship of *λατρεία*.

What now is on the other side? “For the determination of Eucharistic questions,” as Freeman points out, “the Ancient Liturgies are more weighty and trustworthy than ecclesiastical writers.” And what is their testimony?

“*In vain is the least shadow of countenance for the proper worship of the Elements or of a Eucharistic Presence sought for*” in them (Freeman, *The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 172).

“The devout prostration and adoration which took place was not addressed to the Elements or to any Presence of God or of Christ on earth. It was . . . expressly directed to God, or Christ, in *Heaven*” (*Ibid.*, p. 173).¹

¹ This great writer further says, referring to the same patristic quotations: “It is on the strength of these passages, and on them alone — since no countenance for it can be found from any other source — from either Scripture or liturgies or the general consent of the Fathers — that the

Let it be carefully noted that *no attempt is made to show any general consent of the Fathers in support of Eucharistic Adoration.* They claim neither the *ubique*, nor the *semper*, nor the *ab omnibus!*

**WHAT IS APOSTOLIC AND PRIMITIVE AS TO
EVENING COMMUNION AND FASTING
COMMUNION?**

Communion on Maundy Thursday

A devout and reverent desire to follow closely the blessed steps of Our Suffering Redeemer in Passion Week has led to a revival of the primitive custom of celebrating the Lord's Supper in the evening of Maundy Thursday. That it has been found edifying and helpful to devotion by very many is not

attempt is made by some in the present day to revive the practice, unheard of till the eleventh or twelfth century, of making an intense act of worship consequent on the consecration of the elements, and directed toward a peculiar Presence of Christ Himself, supposed to be produced thereby" (*The Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist*, p. 185).

"With the utmost solemnity, in the name of the Christian Faith, and of the whole undivided Church for the first thousand years of its existence, I would enter a most earnest protest against the re-introduction of novelties at once so groundless and so fatal" (*Ibid.*, p. 186).

to be truly denied. It is equally certain that it attracts numbers who are not usually seen at the Table of the Lord.

This is the observation of priests of the Church who have been ministering the Holy Sacrament for more than a generation. We are sometimes told that this custom springs “from sentimentality.” But the Three Hours’ devotion on Good Friday is open to the same allegation. So is Holy Week. So is the observance of the Church year.

Our Lord instituted the Holy Communion in the evening — “the same night in which He was betrayed.” Neither He nor his disciples partook of it fasting; they had just eaten the passover.

St. Paul celebrated it after nightfall (Acts xx. 7, 8) and the service continued until midnight.

The primitive Church administered the Communion frequently, if not generally, in the evening.

Evening celebrations were widely prevalent in Cyprian’s day (third century); he argues that there is a greater worthiness in the morning than the evening Communion —

which is not an absolute condemnation of the latter. We know of no word of Cyprian against evening Communion on Maundy Thursday. St. Augustine (fifth century), in answer to a correspondent, states that the practice of the Church did not condemn Communion on Maundy Thursday, after the evening meal. Indeed the custom prevailed at that time "that on the Thursday in Holy Week, the anniversary of the Institution, the faithful received Holy Communion in the evening and after eating" (see Bingham's *Antiquities*, vol. ii. p. 1188).

Let it be noted that in the Council of Hippo Regius, A. D. 393, a canon was passed through the influence of St. Augustine (at that time not a Bishop) requiring all to receive the Communion fasting, but express exception was made of Maundy Thursday ("excepto uno die anniversario quo Cœna Dominica celebretur").

The same regulation, with the same exception, was adopted at the Council of Carthage, A. D. 397, and by another Council in the same place A. D. 419. In all three of these Councils the influence of St. Augustine was paramount, yet all three of them expressly al-

lowed the evening Communion on Maundy Thursday.

Not, so far as I am aware, until the Council of Trullo, A. D. 680, was this custom actually forbidden.

The appeal is to history. And history shows that in the Apostolic Church and in the Primitive Church the custom objected to held full sway, and that it did not begin to be discredited until the centuries when the purity of apostolic custom and scriptural truth began to be corrupted. Thus the authority of the Primitive Church of the first four centuries (to which the Anglican Church has ever appealed) is distinctly in favor of the evening Communion on Maundy Thursday. Many of the worst corruptions of Catholic doctrine and usage, whose full flower we see in Modern Romanism, began to show themselves in this very fifth century when evening Communion on Maundy Thursday began to fall into disrepute. We recall the superstitious uses made of the consecrated bread, as when it was given to infants, and by some even to the dead; when it was reserved by the people in their houses as a charm and a protection. Miraculous

effects were ascribed to it, as when St. Ambrose in his funeral sermon on his brother relates that, being shipwrecked, Satyrus was saved from drowning because he had a piece of the divine sacrament tied round his neck.

The real objection to evening Communion then (and we think now also) arose from the adoption of the unscriptural idea that the sacrament ought always to be taken fasting. Were that idea eliminated, we should hear very little of the impropriety or irreverence of celebrating the Communion in the evening.

But aside from the superstitious views which encouraged the practice of fasting Communion and therefore condemned the celebration on the evening of Thursday in Holy Week, there was a good reason for the ecclesiastical rule of Fasting Communion at that particular epoch. It was the gross intemperance which prevailed in all classes of society at the close of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century which made such a rule almost a necessity. When the Emperor adopted the Christian religion, a flood of semi-pagans came into the Church, and these did not hesitate to come to the Communion "stuffed with food and drunken

with wine." This is what moved the great Augustine to urge a canon requiring Fasting Communion. He said: "Rioting and drunkenness are so tolerated and allowed by public opinion that even in the services designed to honor the memory of the blessed martyrs, they are openly practiced."

We may judge of the character of the age when we note that a canon was passed prohibiting the clergy from feasting in church, except under strong necessity. In the light of facts like these we can understand why St. Augustine was so solicitous to require a fasting reception of the Communion. Such a necessity, thank God! does not exist among us today.

But note that St. Augustine did not attempt to abolish the celebration of the Communion on the evening of Maundy Thursday.

It is sometimes said that "an evening Communion can hardly be a Eucharist, that is to say, a true act of worship." The best answer to this lies in an appeal to Christian experience. Multitudes of God's saints will testify that they habitually make a true act of worship in the evening — sometimes rise then to their highest plane of adoration.

The Church of England, and our own as well, has laid down no rule on the subject of the time of day or night when the Communion should be celebrated. Hence let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind upon this subject; and let each concede to his brother complete liberty therein.

Surely a “protest” against a custom which can plead the example of Christ and the Apostles and the primitive Church in its purest days, is out of place; is a breach of charity; and ought to be resisted, as when St. Paul withheld Peter to the face.

Evening Communion

Passing from the more immediate subject of this note, I wish to add a few words more about evening Communion in general.

In confirmation of what I have said above, consider the following from the pen of a Roman Catholic theologian, the Rev. Jas. Kane, Sub-Dean of Maynooth College, in his Notes on the Roman Ritual: “The Blessed Eucharist was instituted by our Lord after supper, and for a short time was celebrated only after supper. Martene shows that for

the first three centuries, and even much later, it was still in many places celebrated after supper.”

Father Kane’s testimony finds an echo from a strange quarter, namely, from the head of the Cowley Fathers, Father Puller. He writes: “We have, I hope, got beyond the notion that the early Church objected to afternoon and evening celebrations. The early Church in no sort of way objected to evening celebrations *per se*. She celebrated continually in the afternoon or evening. She had an evening celebration every day in Lent. . . . It is a complete mistake to suppose that the early Church had any objection to afternoon or evening celebrations.”

It is interesting, and decidedly significant, to find that the members of the C. B. S. (that is, “the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament”) were required a few years ago, and are, perhaps, still required, to pray “that evening communion may cease.” This custom, hallowed by our Divine Lord’s own example and by that of His Apostles and of the early Church for more than three hundred years, is, by these ecclesiastics, de-

nounced as irreverent, profane, dangerous, etc. Thus they make the example of Christ of none effect by their tradition.

(The object of the C. B. S. is to promote Eucharistic Adoration. Its anniversaries are held on Corpus Christi Day — a Roman, not an Anglican festival. Its theology is far more Roman than Anglican.)

From all this it follows that any priest of the Church is at liberty, in his discretion, to celebrate the Holy Communion in the evening, if the circumstances of his flock seem to demand it, and in doing so he has the precedent of the apostolic and the primitive Church to justify him.

Fasting Communion

Closely akin to the matter just spoken of is that of Fasting Communion.

Here, again, we have an example of the “teaching for doctrine the commandments of men,” which our Lord so strongly condemned. The late Bishop Samuel Wilberforce of Oxford, a very able and illustrious man, and a high churchman of the older type, wrote as follows upon this subject: “It is

not in a light sense that I say this new doctrine of Fasting Communion is dangerous. The practice is not advocated because a man comes in a clearer spirit and a less disturbed body and mind, able to give himself entirely to prayer and communion with God, but in a miserable, degraded notion that the consecrated elements will meet with other food in the stomach. *It is a detestable materialism.* Philosophically, it is a contradiction; because, when the Celebration is over, you may hurry away to a meal, and the process about which you were so scrupulous immediately follows. The whole notion is simply disgusting.

“The patristic quotations by which the custom is supported are misquotations. St. Chrysostom’s saying on the subject applies to the full mid-day meal, not to the light repast of our ordinary breakfast. It is put on the moral grounds that after a feast there will be fullness, and during a feast there will be jesting and talking, all which constitute a moral unfitness for so high a ceremonial. . . . Fasting till the mid-day Communion is irritation to the nerves, unfitting you to partake in this holy office” (Dean Burgon’s

Lives of Twelve Good Men, p. 271, Scribner, 1891).

Let us observe clearly the issue. It is not whether any one may make a rule for himself that he will ordinarily, at least at the early service, approach the Communion fasting in order to have "a clearer spirit and a less disturbed body," but whether the clergy may rightly urge Fasting Communion upon their people, either as obligatory or as a rule of higher sanctity, on the materialistic grounds so severely and so justly condemned by Bishop Wilberforce, or upon any other grounds.

Now, there is not a shred of evidence in the New Testament that any such practice was observed by the Apostolic Church. Our Lord instituted the Sacrament "as they were eating," and He condemned in principle the idea on which it is based when He said, "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man."

Neither, so far as I know, is there any evidence that in the Primitive Church of the first three centuries there was any *requirement* that the faithful should approach the Lord's Table fasting. The Christian era was nearly four hundred years old before any

canon was adopted requiring it as a regular practice. The Council of Hippo Regius in Numidia, A. D. 393, and two Councils of Carthage, A. D. 397 and A. D. 419, passed such a canon, as we have said above, making exception, however, of the Thursday in Holy Week. But the reason urged by St. Augustine for the passage of this canon was far indeed removed from the gross materialistic conception by which it is now supported — it was to prevent people coming in gluttony and intoxication to the Holy Table.¹

¹ See an Essay on Fasting Communion, by Rev. George B. Hopson, D.D., Professor at St. Stephen's College, Annandale, N. Y., 1889. See also the work of Bishop Kingdon on *Fasting Communion*, pp. 384, Longmans, Green & Co., 1875.

Dr. Hopson refers us to the teaching of Thomas Aquinas, and says: "According to that theory one may finish a heavy meal at midnight, and yet, five minutes after, be in a proper fasting condition to partake of the Eucharist; but if, after a light supper and a night's sleep, he should chance to swallow a mouthful of water, he would be unable to partake of the Sacrament.

"Fasting Communion, in the modern sense of the term, grew out of the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Church, in her XXVIIIth Article, condemns. Those who hold that the bread and wine are changed by consecration into the body and blood of Christ believe, as Meyrick expresses it, that 'It is irreverent and wrong to allow any food to enter the stomach before that which is considered to have become, not only to the soul and to the faith, but to the teeth and to the digestive organs, the Body of the Lord.' If they were consistent with themselves they

This Church has ever appealed to the example and teaching of the Primitive Church of the first three or four centuries. But the rule of Fasting Communion, when brought to that tribunal, must be adjudged to be not primitive, as it certainly is not apostolic. And that which is neither apostolic nor primitive cannot be Catholic.

I am aware of the evidence from St. Ambrose, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. Augustine of the existence of the custom of Fasting Communion; but, 1. This testimony is all late in the fourth or actually in the fifth cen-

would fast after the communion as well as before it, as was the custom of some Christians from the sixth century to the fourteenth" (pp. 11, 12).

The practical working of this notion of the obligation of Fasting Communion is well illustrated by Dr. Hopson in the following passage: "But when priests of the Church teach the laity that it is a mortal sin to receive the Eucharist unless they are fasting in their technical sense of the term; when, as has been affirmed of some in our Mother Church in England, they have refused to administer the sacrament to invalids, because the physician had ordered them to take food every two hours; and when the sacrament has been refused to a dying man, because he or the priest had taken food since the preceding midnight; then it may well be questioned whether they are not teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, and putting a yoke upon the necks of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear" (*Essay on Fasting Communion*, p. 3).

tury. 2. They refer to no canon earlier than 393. 3. Others beside Chrysostom may use the term "fasting" as Bishop Wilberforce explains above. 4. They all stand close to or in the age when apostolic doctrine began to be corrupted. 5. Their example cannot outweigh that of the first three centuries.

In further illustration of the subject a Committee of Bishops of the Province of Canterbury presented to Convocation a Report in May, 1894, in which they state that "In the Apostolic Age the Holy Communion was administered in connection with the gathering together of Christians to share in an appointed evening meal." They also state that "the practice of communicating in the early morning appears to have arisen about the close of the first century, probably in order to secure a safer as well as more reverent celebration."

Also, that "fasting reception became the regular and recognized usage of the Church before the end of the Fourth Century."

Also, "That from the close of the fourth century this usage was formulated in rules for the clergy in Canons of local and provincial councils."

Also, "That fasting reception of the Communion was the prescribed rule of the Church of England during the Anglo-Saxon period."

Also, "That at the Reformation the Church of England ceased to require the Communion to be received fasting."

These statements of the Bishops are not in conflict with the position taken by me in a previous paper. A similar report on the same subject unanimously adopted by the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of York, May 4, 1899, condemns certain widely circulated manuals "in which fasting reception is made one of the things required of them who come to the Lord's Supper." It also states that "The circumstances of the institution of the Holy Eucharist exclude the thought that taking food shortly before disqualifies for participation in it. The same conclusion follows from St. Paul's treatment of the Sacrament in 1 Cor. xi. Nor is the obligation of fasting reception supported by any authority of Scripture or by any Apostolic Ordinance."

The learned John Johnson, author of *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, says "even in the fifth

century whole churches chose to have their Communion in the evening and upon a full stomach.” See *Anglo-Catholic Library*, vol. ii. (among the Addenda).

In confirmation of my statement about non-communicating attendance, I cite the words of one of the greatest scholars of our generation, the late Dr. Hort, Bishop Westcott’s collaborer: “To the best of my knowledge there is no evidence for the practice of non-communicating attendance in at least the first four centuries, except as a penal privation inflicted on one class of penitents, or, as a popular abuse, rebuked by authority. The doctrinal grounds on which it is defended appear to me to receive no support from Scripture, or from any formulary of the Church of England; and the results to which it naturally leads are in my belief disastrous” (*Life*, ii. p. 338).

As to the discipline of private Confession and Absolution, at the famous Round Table Conference, Fulham Palace, Jan. 1, 1902—a Conference representing all schools of Churchmanship and in which the most conspicuous leaders of the ritualistic party participated—among the few things on which

252 CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES

there was unanimous agreement was this: "The discipline of private Confession and Absolution cannot be shown to have existed for some centuries after the foundation of the Church."

Date Due

316 - '43



Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01032 7064